

DOCUMENT RESUME

07901 - [C3128227]

Free Legal Services for the Poor: Increased Coordination, Community Legal Education, and Outreach Needed. HRD-78-164; B-130515(6). November 6, 1978. 23 pp. + 4 appendices (112 pp.).

Report to the Congress; by Elmer B. Staats, Comptroller General.

Issue Area: Federally Sponsored or Assisted Income Security Programs: Legal Services for the Economically Disadvantaged (1312).

Contact: Human Resources Div.

Budget Function: Income Security: Public Assistance and Other Income Supplements (604); Miscellaneous: Financial Management and Information Systems (1002).

Organization Concerned: Legal Services Corp.; Administration on Aging.

Congressional Relevance: House Committee on the Judiciary; Senate Committee on the Judiciary; Congress.

Authority: Legal Services Corporation Act of 1974 (P.L. 93-355). Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (P.L. 88-452). Older Americans Act of 1965 (P.L. 89-73, as amended). Social Security Amendments of 1974 (P.L. 93-647). Social Security Act, title XX. Social Security Act, title IV. Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973. B-130515 (1969).

As created by Public Law, the Legal Services Corporation is a private, nonmembership, nonprofit corporation, and is the primary provider of free civil legal services to the Nation's poor. The Corporation received appropriations of \$125 million and \$205 million for fiscal years 1977 and 1978, respectively, and an estimated \$76 million was also available in 1977 for legal services to the poor from other sources; this was distributed almost equally among Corporation- and non-Corporation-funded providers. Findings/Conclusions: Substantial resources exist for free legal services to the poor from Federal, State, and local sources in addition to those provided by the Corporation. Although the Corporation entered into an agreement with the Administration on Aging to provide services to the elderly, it relies primarily on local projects' initiatives to identify and coordinate activities. Some Corporation grantees were not aware of other available providers and resources in the service area, and improved coordination is needed to ensure maximum use of all potential resources. Few Corporation grantees have conducted or obtained assessments of the legal needs of the poor in their communities for the purpose of establishing service priorities. The Corporation cited insufficient time or resources as the reason for not conducting periodic local needs assessments. Such periodic assessments would help assure that project priorities and resources are directed to the most prevalent problems. Community legal education and outreach efforts have been limited by the unavailability of staffing and resources. Recommendations: The

President of the Legal Services Corporation should: explore the potential for obtaining national coordination agreements with Federal and non-Federal funding sources; provide guidance to grantees for identifying and determining the nature of nonproject resources in their communities; encourage grantees to seek support from local bar associations, law schools, and other potential resource providers; disseminate information to grantees regarding innovative approaches to assessing legal needs; provide guidance to grantees for performing periodic needs assessments; encourage grantees to seek assistance from social service agencies in assessing local needs; expand training sessions on community legal education; and provide individual projects with needed technical assistance. (F&S)

BY THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

Report To The Congress

OF THE UNITED STATES

Free Legal Services For The Poor-- Increased Coordination, Community Legal Education, And Outreach Needed

The Legal Services Corporation is the primary provider of funds for free civil legal services for the poor. Substantial funds for such services are also available from other Federal, State, and local sources and are administered by Corporation and non-Corporation providers.

Coordination among providers of legal services, efforts by Corporation grantees to establish service priorities based on local needs, and grantee legal education and outreach activities have been limited.

The Corporation should

- increase coordination activities at the national and local levels and
- make sure that its grantees periodically assess community needs and improve legal education and outreach efforts.

The Legal Services Corporation agreed with GAO's recommendations and indicated it was working as rapidly as possible to carry them out.





COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20548

B-130515(6)

To the President of the Senate and the
Speaker of the House of Representatives

This report discusses the activities of the Legal Services Corporation and its grantees in providing free civil legal services to the poor. Because of the Corporation's rapidly increasing budgets and the support available from other sources for legal services to the poor, we reviewed coordination among providers, extent to which services provided reflect local needs, and community legal education and outreach efforts. The report makes recommendations to the Corporation for improving these efforts.

We made our review pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67).

We are sending copies of this report to the Director, Office of Management and Budget, and the President, Legal Services Corporation.

A handwritten signature in black ink, which appears to read "Thomas A. Ruck", is positioned above the printed name of the Comptroller General.

Comptroller General
of the United States

COMPTROLLER GENERAL'S
REPORT TO THE CONGRESS

FREE LEGAL SERVICES FOR THE
POOR--INCREASED COORDINATION,
COMMUNITY LEGAL EDUCATION, AND
OUTREACH NEEDED

D I G E S T

The Legal Services Corporation, the primary source of financial support for free civil legal assistance to the poor, currently funds over 300 legal services projects nationwide.

The Corporation's appropriations have increased from \$92 million for fiscal year 1976 to \$270 million for fiscal year 1979. GAO estimates that during 1977 approximately \$76 million in resources was also available annually for free civil legal services to the poor from other Federal, State, and local resource providers. Administration of the non-Corporation resources was divided almost equally between Corporation and non-Corporation legal services organizations.

COORDINATING RESOURCES FOR
CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES

Substantial funds and other resources exist for free legal services to the poor from Federal, State, and local sources in addition to those provided by the Legal Services Corporation. Although the Corporation has entered into a cooperative agreement with the Administration on Aging to increase the delivery of services to the elderly, it relies principally on local projects' initiative to identify and coordinate their activities with over 20 other major categorical Federal and non-Federal resource providers.

These projects secured \$40.3 million in 1977 from these providers for direct administration by the projects. In

addition, \$35.7 million in non-Corporation resources was available during 1977 that was not administered by Corporation grantees. About \$856,000--or about 1 percent of total funding from non-Corporation providers--constituted direct-funding support from bar associations to projects. Projects estimated that an additional \$2.2 million in services was received from the bar, including attorney and paralegal support. Local project officials indicated that they have generally met with limited success in their efforts to obtain support from bar associations and private attorneys.

Some Corporation grantees were not aware of other providers and resources available in the service area. Improved coordination is needed--particularly where projects are overburdened with requests for services--to make sure that maximum use of all potential resources and efficient and effective delivery of free legal services are reaching those in need.

IDENTIFYING LEGAL SERVICE NEEDS IN THE COMMUNITY

The Corporation requires its grantees to establish service priorities and to obtain the views of the client community in the priority-setting process. The methods of determining the legal needs of the poor in the area served and the degree of client community involvement in the process are determined by individual grantees.

GAO sent questionnaires to all known legal services providers in the Nation. Of the 249 Corporation grantees responding to the questionnaire, 45 had conducted or obtained local legal needs assessments for the purpose of establishing service priorities. Other

grantees had developed priorities without structured needs assessment processes based on past demand and perceived needs of the community or had not developed priorities and accepted clients primarily on a first-come-first-served basis.

GAO contacted questionnaire respondents that had performed assessments and found that methods used to perform needs assessments varied in scope and sophistication. Among the approaches employed were

- interviewing random samples of all eligible low-income families in major urban or rural population centers as a basis for needs assessments studies performed by the grantee or local bar association;
- holding community meetings with eligible clients throughout a State to identify local needs which are presented at an annual meeting of the project for setting priorities; and
- sending inquiry letters on needs to local social service organizations, client groups, bar associations, and numerous other local organizations and conducting a limited questionnaire survey of prospective clients' legal needs in an urban population center.

The reasons cited by the Corporation for not periodically assessing the local legal needs of the poor were insufficient time or resources. Most social service agencies contacted in the communities visited were willing to assist grantees in performing needs assessments.

Periodic local needs assessments by all Corporation grantees would help assure that project priorities and resources are directed to the most prevalent legal problems in the community.

COMMUNITY LEGAL EDUCATION AND OUTREACH

Community legal education and outreach by Corporation projects are essential to assure an awareness of available legal services by all who are eligible and to provide functional knowledge on the ways such services can or cannot be used. The Corporation became concerned that few of its 300 projects had found the time or resources to conduct legal education or outreach efforts, and initiated a survey to determine what projects were doing.

About 30 projects responded describing ongoing or recent community legal education programs funded from both Corporation and non-Corporation resources. Twenty other projects indicated they were in the process of initiating new community legal education programs. Almost all projects responding to the survey indicated increased community legal education efforts were needed but that limited resources prevented adequate expansion.

The responses indicated a number of innovative approaches being employed that would expand community knowledge of legal services. Some methods were being used to reduce the demands on project attorneys' time by providing clients with direct legal information services through telephone law libraries and other educational media, such as television, education programs in the schools, pamphlets, and lectures.

To expand the knowledge of effective community legal education techniques to other projects, the Corporation conducted a training session to apprise local projects of the methods. Initially, 60 projects expressed an interest in community education and 48 were chosen to participate in the Corporation's first course in June 1978. The Corporation plans additional community legal education activities as interest and need are indicated.

Of the nine grantees in GAO's review, seven engaged in limited or no community legal education and outreach programs. Reasons cited for the limited efforts included lack of staffing and resources and concerns with the impact of increased awareness.

GAO interviewed at random 1,260 eligible poor persons at welfare, community action, and other social services agencies in communities served by the grantees. About 60 percent of the persons interviewed were not aware that free legal services were available, and only about half of those who were aware that providers existed knew the types of services offered. Many who were unaware of the providers in the community had problems that could have been addressed by legal services programs.

To alleviate imbalances in awareness and insure equal access to legal services for the poor, increased community education and outreach efforts are needed. Improved community education efforts could enable the poor to resolve some potential legal problems without the services of an attorney, thereby enabling projects to deal with more complex problems and expand outreach efforts by Corporation projects.

RECOMMENDATIONS

GAO recommends that the president of the Legal Services Corporation:

- Explore the potential for obtaining other national coordination agreements with Federal and non-Federal funding sources by using the experience gained through the cooperative arrangement with the Administration on Aging. (See p. 12.)
- Provide guidance to grantees for identifying and determining the nature of nonproject resources for civil legal services in their communities and for coordinating project efforts with other providers. (See p. 12.)

- Encourage grantees to seek support from local bar associations, law schools, and other potential resource providers that could expand available services to the community. (See p. 12.)
- Disseminate information to grantees regarding innovative approaches to assessing local legal needs. (See p. 17.)
- Provide guidance to grantees for performing periodic needs assessments that include participation of the poor in the community using methods compatible with grantee operating characteristics. (See p. 17.)
- Encourage grantees to seek assistance from social service agencies in assessing local needs. (See p. 17.)
- Expand training sessions on community legal education and require grantees to submit plans for addressing community education with their budget submissions. (See p. 22.)
- Provide individual projects with needed technical assistance in developing community legal education programs that are suitable to the client community they serve. (See p. 23.)

CORPORATION COMMENTS

The Legal Services Corporation agreed with GAO's recommendations and indicated it was working as rapidly as possible to carry them out.

C o n t e n t s

		<u>Page</u>
DIGEST		i
CHAPTER		
1	INTRODUCTION	1
	Development of the legal	
	services program	2
	Scope of review	3
2	COORDINATING RESOURCES FOR	
	CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES	5
	Resources available from	
	non-Corporation providers	5
	Coordination among providers	
	of civil legal services	7
	Efforts to use other available	
	resources	8
	Conclusions	11
	Recommendations	11
	Corporation comments	12
3	IDENTIFYING LEGAL SERVICE NEEDS	
	IN THE COMMUNITY	14
	Local needs assessments and	
	service priorities	14
	Corporation efforts	16
	Conclusions	17
	Recommendations	17
	Corporation comments	17
4	COMMUNITY LEGAL EDUCATION AND	
	OUTREACH SERVICES	19
	Grantee community legal	
	education and outreach efforts	19
	Corporation efforts	21
	Conclusions	22
	Recommendations	22
	Corporation comments	23

APPENDIX

		<u>Page</u>
I	Estimated non-Corporation funding for legal services	24
II	Results of GAO's national provider questionnaire	25
III	Results of GAO's potential client interviews	75
IV	Letter dated September 11, 1978, from the president of the Legal Services Corporation	131

ABBREVIATIONS

ABA	American Bar Association
AOA	Administration on Aging
GAO	General Accounting Office
LSC	Legal Services Corporation

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The Legal Services Corporation Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-355, July 25, 1974), as amended, created the Legal Services Corporation as a private, nonmembership, nonprofit corporation to provide financial support for civil legal assistance to persons unable to afford such services. The act authorizes the Corporation to make grants or contracts to provide financial assistance to qualified programs furnishing legal assistance to eligible persons, and requires it to establish maximum income eligibility levels in consultation with the Office of Management and Budget and the States. The act also requires the Corporation to ensure that grantees establish priorities for providing services that consider the relative needs of persons unable to afford legal assistance, and that grants and contracts are made so as to provide the most economical and effective delivery of legal assistance to those in both urban and rural areas.

The Corporation currently funds over 300 legal services projects nationwide. The projects are staffed by over 3,700 attorneys and 1,600 paralegals who work to provide the poor with access to the Nation's legal system and who handle an estimated 1.2 million legal problems annually.

The Corporation's appropriations have increased from \$92 million for fiscal year 1976 to \$270 million for fiscal year 1979. In addition, resources are available from other Federal, State, and local sources for free civil legal services to the poor.

Because of the Corporation's increasing budgets and the support available from non-Corporation sources for free legal services to the poor, our objectives were to identify the resources available nationally from all sources for free civil legal services and assess the

- coordination among the providers,
- extent to which services provided reflect local community needs, and
- adequacy of grantee community legal education and outreach services.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE LEGAL SERVICES PROGRAM

Federal support for free civil legal services to the poor began in 1965 through a program established in the Office of Economic Opportunity under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (Public Law 88-452, Aug. 20, 1964), as amended. Prior to 1965, free civil legal services to low-income persons were provided through volunteer efforts of private attorneys and through privately funded legal aid societies.

The Office of Economic Opportunity operated the Legal Services Program until January 1975 when responsibility was transferred to the Community Services Administration pending creation of the new Corporation. The Corporation assumed control and funding of the program in October 1975, when there were 258 legal services programs operated by grantees in 638 offices located in the 50 States, Puerto Rico, Micronesia, and the Virgin Islands.

Corporation grantees are governed by local boards of directors which include private attorneys and representatives from the poor community. The programs employ lawyers and staff who provide legal advice and representation to those who qualify. The Corporation prescribes maximum income eligibility levels within which each program must set its own standards recognizing living costs and other local factors. While family income is the primary consideration when determining eligibility for free legal services, other circumstances which may affect a person's ability to pay, such as medical and child care expenses, may also be considered.

The Corporation's Office of Field Services manages the grants to local legal services programs and contracts with 13 support centers which provide specialized assistance to project attorneys in representing clients. The Office, assisted by the nine regional offices, is responsible for reviewing and approving grant applications, supervising grant processing, providing management assistance, and monitoring the performance of the programs. Each regional office is responsible for evaluating the programs in its region four times annually.

Although most Corporation-funded programs provide general civil legal assistance to the poor, some emphasize

such areas as consumer affairs, law for the elderly, government benefits, housing, and family law, while others specialize in serving migrant workers or Native Americans. The Corporation found that of the matters handled by programs in 1977, about 14 percent dealt with consumer problems, 18 percent with housing, 19 percent with administrative benefits, 31 percent with family law, and 18 percent with various other types of legal problems.

The Legal Services Program administered by the Office of Economic Opportunity was the subject of two of our prior reports issued in August 1969 and March 1973 which discussed the management and administration of the program and recommended actions to improve its effectiveness. We also recently issued a report to the Chairman of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary which discusses the Corporation's system for managing expanded resources, its budget development process, and its efforts to identify more efficient and effective systems for delivering legal services to the poor. ^{1/} We recommended that the Corporation place priority on developing and implementing project management systems needed to provide information necessary to develop more effective budgets and to evaluate local legal services efforts.

SCOPE OF REVIEW

Our review was conducted at 9 Corporation grantees and 58 non-Corporation-funded legal services providers in 26 communities located in 5 States. We reviewed records and interviewed officials of the providers to determine the availability of civil legal resources for the poor and the nature of coordination, community education, and outreach activities.

To estimate the non-Corporation resources available nationally for civil legal services to the poor (see app. I) and determine the nature and extent of services

^{1/}"Effectiveness and Administration of the Legal Services Program Under Title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964," (B-130515, Aug. 7, 1969). "The Legal Services Program--Accomplishments of and Problems Faced by its Grantees," (B-130515, Mar. 21, 1973). "Expanding Budget Requests for Civil Legal Needs of the Poor--Is More Control for Effective Services Required?" (B-130515(6), Apr. 26, 1978).

provided, we sent questionnaires to all identifiable providers. The questionnaires were mailed in March 1977 to 278 Corporation-funded providers and 323 non-Corporation-funded providers identified with the assistance of the Corporation, the National Legal Aid and Defender Association, the American Bar Association (ABA), and the National Clients Council. Ninety percent of the Corporation grantees and 62 percent of the other providers responded by July 1977. Information requested included staffing data, clients served, nature and extent of caseloads, and identification of all available resources. The questionnaire responses are summarized in appendix II.

In the 26 communities visited, we interviewed judges, local bar association members, county board supervisors, representatives of law schools and related clinics, and various other community leaders to obtain views on the activities and impact of the local legal services programs. We also interviewed at random 1,260 poor persons in the communities to determine the type and extent of legal problems experienced, the nature of assistance obtained, the extent to which interviewees experienced problems which they did not recognize to be of a legal nature, and the level of awareness and use of free legal services available in the communities.

The interviews were conducted in welfare offices; Social Security Administration offices; local organizations oriented to the poor, such as community action agencies; and residences located in predominantly poor neighborhoods. While it was impractical to select respondents in a manner which would yield results that could be projected nationally, the questionnaire results are indicative of conditions existing in the communities we visited. The responses are summarized in appendix III.

We also reviewed applicable legislation, regulations, policies, and other related records and interviewed officials at Corporation headquarters in Washington, D.C., and at pertinent regional offices.

CHAPTER 2

COORDINATING RESOURCES

FOR CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES

The Legal Services Corporation received appropriations of \$125 million and \$205 million for fiscal years 1977 and 1978, respectively, and is the primary provider of free civil legal services to the Nation's poor. An estimated \$76 million was also available in 1977 for legal services to the poor from other sources and was distributed almost equally among Corporation- and non-Corporation-funded providers.

The Corporation entered into an agreement with the Administration on Aging (AOA)--which funds legal services for the elderly--to promote cooperative working relationships at the Federal, State, and local levels. The Corporation believes the agreement has been beneficial and has resulted in effective coordination at the local level.

The Corporation requires grantees to consider other sources of legal assistance in the area when establishing service priorities and relies on local projects to identify and coordinate activities with over 20 other major categorical Federal and non-Federal resource providers in their service areas. Corporation projects secured about \$40.3 million from such providers in 1977, and an additional \$35.7 million was available to projects not funded by the Corporation. Corporation projects had limited success in obtaining support from bar associations and private attorneys, and some were not aware of other providers and resources in the service area. Improved coordination is needed to ensure maximum use of all resources and efficient and effective delivery of free legal services to the poor.

RESOURCES AVAILABLE FROM NON-CORPORATION PROVIDERS

Based on responses to our national questionnaire, we estimated that an annual level of over \$200 million was spent nationally on civil legal services for the poor during project fiscal periods ending in 1977. Of this amount about \$76 million came from non-Corporation funding and was distributed among Corporation and non-Corporation providers as described below and in greater detail in appendix I.

	<u>Federal</u>	<u>Non-Federal</u>	<u>Total</u>
Corporation projects	\$25,254,093	\$15,076,234	\$40,330,327
Non-Corporation projects	<u>17,110,155</u>	<u>18,583,777</u>	<u>35,693,932</u>
Total	<u>\$42,364,248</u>	<u>\$33,660,011</u>	<u>\$76,024,259</u>

Federal funding of legal services from non-Corporation sources, which constitutes about 56 percent of non-Corporation resources, is provided by at least 7 Federal agencies involving at least 10 individual programs. Among Federal sources the primary funding agencies are the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Department of Labor. Among non-Federal sources State and local governments and private charities were the most substantial providers of funds.

Corporation projects actively solicit outside resources with a fair measure of success, as evidenced by responses to our national questionnaire. However, most projects indicated that local bar associations provided little encouragement for financial support of project activities by private law firms and local governments, and over half of the projects responding to our questionnaire indicated that they actively solicited local assistance from attorneys and law firms. About 32 percent of Corporation projects responding to our questionnaire indicated that they had little or no success in obtaining assistance from attorneys and law firms, 37 percent had some success, 20 percent had moderate success, and 11 percent described the assistance as ranging from substantial to very large.

Of \$76 million in non-Corporation resources available during 1977 that was administered by Corporation and non-Corporation grantees, about \$856,000--or about 1 percent of total funding from non-Corporation providers--constituted direct-funding support from bar associations to projects. Projects estimated that an additional \$2.2 million in services was received from the bar, including attorney and paralegal support.

While some of the funds available from non-Corporation sources have qualifications on the target population or areas to be served, the funds are generally designated for the poor. For example, AOA funds under the Older Americans Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-73, as amended) can only be used for the elderly, and priority is given to those with the greatest economic and social needs--most Corporation projects emphasize the elderly poor. Funds for civil legal services under title XX authorized by the Social Security Amendments

of 1974 (Public Law 93-647, Jan. 4, 1975) can be applied quite broadly in the interests of the poor, whereas funds from the Community Development Block Grant program of the Department of Housing and Urban Development are allocated to areas based largely on the incidence of poverty.

Corporation projects responding to our questionnaire indicated that most other resources carried no restrictions on use: almost 80 percent of such funds had no limitations on the types of civil legal problems which could be handled and over 70 percent had no limitations on the clients who could be served other than being poor. About 13 percent of such funds were limited to geographic areas smaller than those served by the projects.

COORDINATION AMONG PROVIDERS OF CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES

The Corporation entered into an agreement with AOA in January 1977 designed to promote cooperative working relationships at the national level and encourage such relationships at the State and local levels between Corporation-funded providers and AOA-funded projects and agencies. The agreement was intended to maximize the capacity of AOA and the Corporation to provide access to legal services for the elderly and to encourage greater participation in such efforts by the private bar and law schools. Specific objectives were to increase (1) awareness by legal personnel of the concerns and problems of the elderly, (2) understanding by the elderly of their legal rights, (3) the number of legal personnel trained to serve and working on behalf of the elderly, (4) access of the elderly to existing legal services, and (5) the number of communities in which services are available. In implementing the objectives, AOA and the Corporation agreed to consider joint activities to avoid duplication of effort and maximize effective use of the resources of each organization.

The Corporation and AOA have found the agreement to be mutually beneficial, and the organizations are currently reviewing experience to date to determine whether the arrangement should be refined to more specifically guide future activities. Benefits of the agreement to date cited by the Corporation include close liaison at the headquarters level (two Corporation employees were detailed to AOA), effective use by the "aging network" of pertinent Corporation publications, and cooperative working arrangements among Corporation regional offices, local project personnel, and State aging agencies. In addition, the Corporation has funded

several projects, including studies, a seminar, and conferences, which have dealt with the type of legal problems frequently encountered by the elderly.

Of the Corporation-funded projects responding to our national questionnaire, 81, or 36 percent, indicated they knew of other resources for civil legal services in the area they served. Of those projects, 14, or about 17 percent, had no relationships with the other providers of resources. Analysis of responses to the questionnaire showed that there were non-Corporation-funded providers of civil legal services located in the same communities as 28 Corporation projects which indicated they knew of no other resources in the area. We were unable to identify any non-Corporation providers of legal services in the communities served by 116 Corporation projects which knew of no other resources in the area.

Two Corporation grantees visited located in urban areas have found it necessary to defer or deny services to potential clients due to staffing limitations. These projects were not aware of all providers of legal services in the area, and in some instances were unaware of the nature of services provided by sources they knew existed.

Knowledge by providers of free civil legal services of the existence and nature of all other resources and providers available in the community can improve the delivery of services to the poor, particularly where projects are overburdened with requests for assistance and could refer persons seeking services to other providers in the community in a timely manner rather than deferring or denying service.

EFFORTS TO USE OTHER AVAILABLE RESOURCES

Many Corporation grantees do not engage in comprehensive efforts to take advantage of resources available for free legal services from bar associations, private attorneys, and law schools and clinics.

Effective use of such resources would increase the capabilities of legal services providers to serve the poor.

Private attorneys and bar associations

The Corporation encourages support for free civil legal services from the private bar through active involvement, participation, and liaison with the organized bar and by distributing Corporation publications to private attorneys. The Corporation has also prepared a compilation identifying about 20 local bar associations across the Nation which provide free civil legal services to the poor.

Corporation grantee efforts to actively solicit free legal services to the poor from attorneys or law firms in the area have been limited. About 15 percent of the Corporation-funded projects responding to the national questionnaire indicated they engaged in little or no efforts to solicit free legal services from local attorneys or law firms, 34 percent engaged in some efforts, 28 percent described their efforts as moderate, and 23 percent indicated their efforts ranged from substantial to very large. About 28 percent of Corporation grantees responding to the questionnaire received about \$1.2 million in funding or services from local bar associations, while 52 percent indicated the associations in the area provided little or no encouragement to attorneys to provide free services.

In one State we visited, only 2 of the 59 bar associations in the area served by a Corporation project provided organized free or reduced fee civil legal services to the poor. Of the nine Corporation grantees we visited, one indicated that local attorneys and law firms provide little or no free legal services, two said some services were provided, four described the services as moderate, and two indicated the attorneys and law firms in the area provided extensive services.

While private attorney participation in providing free services to the poor is generally not mandatory, the ABA Code of Professional Responsibility states in part:

"The basic responsibility for providing legal services for those unable to pay ultimately rests upon the individual lawyer, and personal involvement in the problems of the disadvantaged can be one of the most rewarding experiences in the life of a lawyer. Every lawyer, regardless of professional prominence or professional workload, should find time to participate in serving the disadvantaged."

In a statement before the 1977 ABA midwinter convention, a former ABA president said every lawyer should devote between 5 and 10 percent of his or her time to legal aid services. There are approximately 450,000 attorneys in the United States today--a potentially significant resource for free civil legal services to the poor.

In some areas, bar associations actively encourage volunteer services by private attorneys. For example, one city bar association with about 12,000 members requires each

of the attorneys participating in its lawyer referral plan to perform one pro bono (free) case annually; there were about 1,200 participants. In another area we visited, a local bar association had sent a letter to its members strongly suggesting that each one donate either 50 hours of pro bono services annually or the equivalent amount of money. The president of one State bar association has suggested that it sponsor legislation requiring the licensing bodies of medicine, dentistry, and law to mandate its members devote 40 hours annually to pro bono activity. In the latter case, the State bar intends to inform all local bar associations of the need for pro bono services and develop a formal mechanism for implementing a systematic voluntary program.

In one large city, private attorneys were queried during a study sponsored by the local bar regarding interest in providing pro bono services. The responses indicated substantial individual interest and willingness to provide these services to low-income families. However, many of the attorneys queried had the impression that there was no need for their services, and the study indicated that some attorneys do not engage in such services because of the lack of a strong commitment by their firms to provide free legal services to the poor.

Increased effort by the Corporation and its grantees to enlist support from private bar associations could substantially increase the resources available for free civil legal services to the poor.

Law schools and clinics

The Corporation relies on its grantees to coordinate with law schools and law school clinical programs. These organizations comprise a potentially significant resource for the delivery of free legal services to poor persons.

There were seven law schools with programs which provide legal services to the poor in the areas served by five of the Corporation projects we visited. Two schools provided students for training purposes to the projects, and in three instances the schools periodically referred clients to the projects. However, none of the projects had established formal relationships with the schools for coordinating the delivery of legal services to the poor. In one area visited, a law clinic with five permanent staff attorneys and a director had an annual budget of \$180,000 for fiscal year 1976--about 30 percent of which was designated for civil legal services. A total of 270 law students participated in the

program and performed various functions, such as interviewing potential clients, doing research, and representing persons at administrative hearings. While most of the civil clients served by the clinic were also eligible to be served by the Corporation grantee, no formal relationship had been established between the two organizations to coordinate activities or refer clients to each other.

Of the Corporation grantees responding to our questionnaire, 71, or about 30 percent, used law students as a resource. A Corporation grantee in one community visited used 60 law students as paralegals and believed more students could be used if attorneys were available to supervise them. Another project in the same community, not funded by the Corporation, used 10 law students as paralegals.

Most Corporation grantees who had developed relationships with law schools and law school clinics believed the arrangements were valuable. In such instances, both the grantees and officials of the organizations involved generally agreed that law students can effectively supplement project staff and that coordination of activities can result in more effective service to the poor.

CONCLUSIONS

Substantial resources exist for free legal services to the poor from Federal, State, and local sources in addition to those provided by the Corporation. Although the Corporation has entered into a cooperative agreement with AOA to enhance the delivery of services to the elderly, it relies principally on local projects' initiative to identify and coordinate their activities with other Federal and non-Federal resource providers. Corporation projects have been successful in obtaining substantial support from other providers, but have had limited success in efforts to obtain support from bar associations and private attorneys.

Some Corporation grantees were not aware of other providers and resources available in the service area. Improved coordination is needed--particularly where projects are overburdened with requests for services--to ensure maximum use of all potential resources and efficient and effective delivery of free legal services to the poor.

RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend that the president of the Legal Services Corporation:

- Explore the potential for obtaining other national coordination agreements with Federal and non-Federal funding sources by using the experience gained through the cooperative arrangement with the Administration on Aging.
- Provide guidance to grantees for identifying and determining the nature of nonproject resources for civil legal services in their communities and for coordinating project efforts with other providers.
- Encourage grantees to seek support from local bar associations, law schools, and other potential resource providers that could expand available services to the community.

CORPORATION COMMENTS

The Legal Services Corporation agreed with our recommendations, noting that coordination among providers of legal services was being achieved. The Corporation recognized the vital importance of non-Corporation resources for the provision of legal assistance to the poor--particularly the private bar.

The Corporation indicated that most non-Corporation funding sources provide funds for a variety of purposes not limited to civil legal services for the poor and that some funds for legal services are not targeted for the poor. The non-Corporation funding estimates discussed on page 6 and depicted in more detail in appendix I were derived from the questionnaire responses wherein projects identified the amount of funds provided by the various sources for civil legal services. As also discussed on page 6, most non-Corporation programs which provide funds for civil legal services give priority to the economically disadvantaged, and non-Corporation funds available to Corporation projects responding to our questionnaire were predominantly for the poor.

The Corporation indicated that, because non-Corporation funding decisions are frequently made at State and local levels, legal services projects are often unable to reliably estimate future support from other sources. Corporation projects responding to our questionnaire predicted that about 60 percent of available non-Corporation funds would continue into succeeding budget years, while non-Corporation projects predicted that about 83 percent of available funding would continue into succeeding budget years.

The Corporation noted that 25 percent of the potential clients we interviewed indicated they experienced at least one legal problem during the year, and estimated on that basis that more than 7 million legal problems were experienced annually by the Nation's poor. As discussed on page 4, our interviews were conducted in the communities we visited and, while indicative of conditions in those areas, did not yield results which could be projected nationally.

The Corporation pointed out that during the last year it has achieved increased coordination among the various providers of legal services, particularly as it has required increased communication and coordination with the bar associations where the legal services program is being expanded into previously unserved areas. The requirements do not apply to areas where services already exist.

The Corporation expressed some disappointment with the information obtained from Corporation and non-Corporation legal services providers because the data was a year old, some of the analyses were not as detailed as the Corporation would have liked, and because the Corporation felt some of the questions were difficult to understand. As depicted in appendix II, the questionnaire was extensive in coverage and required considerable time for the providers to complete and return. Also, considerable time was required to ensure full and accurate reporting of the responses. Ninety percent of the Corporation grantees and 62 percent of the other providers responded to the questionnaire, thus providing a high degree of statistical reliability. With few exceptions, each question was answered by most respondents. As agreed with the Corporation, we are making the basic data available for its use on more detailed analysis beneficial to its operating requirements.

CHAPTER 3

IDENTIFYING LEGAL SERVICE NEEDS

IN THE COMMUNITY

The Corporation requires that clients comprise one-third of the governing boards of its projects and that its grantees establish service priorities and obtain the views of the client community in the process. The Corporation requires that such priorities consider the local legal needs of the poor in the community served, and relies on individual grantees to develop the method for estimating the needs of the poor and to determine the degree of client community involvement in the priority-setting process.

Few Corporation grantees responding to our national questionnaire and visited during the review have conducted or obtained current assessments of the local legal needs of the poor for the purpose of setting service priorities. The others developed priorities without a structured needs assessment process based on past demand and perceived needs of the community or had not developed priorities and accepted clients primarily on a first-come-first-served basis.

LOCAL NEEDS ASSESSMENTS AND SERVICE PRIORITIES

The Corporation requires grantees to establish priorities and include the client community in the process, but does not require its grantees to periodically assess the legal needs of the poor. Of the 249 Corporation projects responding to the national questionnaire, 45 indicated they had conducted or obtained needs assessments. Of the projects responding, 61 percent indicated they accept clients on a first-come-first-served basis of which almost half of the projects indicated that "first come, first served" was the sole criterion used.

Of the nine Corporation projects we visited, three had performed needs assessments. The directors of the other projects generally indicated that they set priorities based upon the projects' perceived needs of the community rather than on a structured assessment of needs.

Reasons cited by the Corporation for not assessing local legal needs include lack of time and a shortage of attorneys to perform assessments. However, we contacted 48 social service agencies in the communities visited, and 39 (80 percent) expressed a willingness to assist in performing community

needs assessments so that Corporation projects would be better able to develop appropriate priorities. There were social service agencies willing to assist the projects in the area served by each of the six grantees which had not performed needs assessments.

Two Corporation grantees visited have initiated innovative efforts to assess legal needs of the poor and develop service priorities with the involvement of the poverty community.

One statewide project, recognizing the importance of a positive relationship between staff attorneys and the client population, holds an annual 3-day conference with representatives of the client community to set case priorities based on expressed needs. During the conference, the previous year's activities and results are reviewed and evaluated.

Eligible clients hold meetings throughout the State prior to the conference to discuss and identify local needs and relative priorities. The community representatives present the views at the conference, and project attorneys establish work plans to implement the clients' priorities and identify the resources needed to accomplish the goals. A client committee meets regularly throughout the year to review the attorney work plans and time estimates to ensure proper implementation of the priorities. In December 1976, the committee reported that the grantee had made a significant change in 2 years from a staff-directed to a client-directed legal services program and that more clients are being served with better quality services.

An independent evaluation team reviewed and endorsed the project's priority-setting process and concluded that:

"As a result of the process, the [project] enjoys the strong support and the enthusiastic participation of the client community. Not only does it offer clients the opportunity to have a substantial impact on the direction of the program, but it also constitutes a beneficial process for the attorneys in that it forces them to concentrate on focusing the limited resources of the [project] in the most efficient way."

Another Corporation grantee we visited had recently completed a limited client survey to assist it in setting service priorities and allocating resources based on the types of services needed. As part of its priority-setting process, it sent inquiry letters on needs to local social service organizations, client groups, bar associations, and numerous other local organizations. Also, criteria are established for special efforts based on the relative costs, potential for success, and anticipated impact of the effort on the client community. A peer review and client review process is used to identify and resolve repetitive client problems in a systematic manner.

In addition to the efforts of the two grantees, a bar association in a major urban center sponsored an extensive study involving interviews of a random sample of all eligible low-income families as a basis for legal needs assessments.

CORPORATION EFFORTS

In an April 26, 1978, report to the Chairman of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary (see p. 3), we recommended that the Corporation further define procedures to be used by grantees in establishing priority systems and provide for periodic evaluations of the systems. In June 1978 we met with Corporation officials to discuss the preliminary results of our review and noted the need for grantees to conduct or obtain current assessments of the local legal needs of the poor for the purpose of setting service priorities.

The Corporation proposed revisions to its regulations designed to insure that grantees adopt policies to recognize the views of eligible clients in establishing priorities for allocating resources. The proposed revisions were published in the Federal Register on July 28, 1978, and comments were requested by September 1978. The regulation would require Corporation projects to adopt procedures which will (1) provide for local legal needs assessments with community involvement, (2) insure that the client community participates in the development of a priority work plan for the project, and (3) provide for periodic reviews of grantee priorities, including the need to revise the priorities as a result of changes in project resources or in the size or needs of the eligible client population.

CONCLUSIONS

Few Corporation grantees have conducted or obtained assessments of the legal needs of the poor in the communities served for the purpose of establishing service priorities. Most developed priorities based on past demands and perceived needs of the community, or had not developed priorities and accepted clients primarily on a first-come-first-served basis.

The reason cited by the Corporation for not conducting periodic local needs assessments was insufficient time or resources. Most social service agencies contacted in the communities visited were willing to assist grantees in performing needs assessments, and two grantees visited had developed innovative approaches to assessing local needs with client community involvement.

Periodic local needs assessments by grantees would help assure that project priorities and resources are directed to the most prevalent problems in the community.

RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend that the president of the Legal Services Corporation:

- Disseminate information to grantees regarding innovative approaches to assessing local legal needs.
- Provide guidance to grantees for performing periodic needs assessments that include participation of the poor in the community using methods compatible with grantee operating characteristics.
- Encourage grantees to seek assistance from social service agencies in assessing local needs.

CORPORATION COMMENTS

The Corporation agreed with our recommendations, noting the need to balance community legal needs assessments with available local project resources, and made the following observations.

The Corporation indicated that local programs regularly obtain information on local legal needs. It stated that it has been conducting a continuing series of training workshops and seminars to enhance local program capability and priority setting and is in the process of developing new grantee

reporting methods which will provide more uniform information to assist in the priority-setting process. The Corporation expects to implement the new reporting methods at all grantees by June 1979.

The Corporation indicated that formal legal needs surveys are often extremely expensive and time consuming. As discussed on page 14, social service agencies in the communities we visited were willing to assist local projects in assessing community legal needs, and some grantees have initiated innovative efforts to assess the legal needs of the poor and develop service priorities with the assistance of the poverty community.

CHAPTER 4

COMMUNITY LEGAL EDUCATION AND OUTREACH SERVICES

Community legal education and outreach by Corporation projects are essential to ensure an awareness of available legal services by all who are eligible and to provide functional knowledge on the ways such services can or cannot be used. Although federally funded legal services programs have existed for several years in each of the communities we visited, community awareness concerning civil legal rights and the availability of free legal services was limited.

The Corporation relies on grantees to determine whether to conduct community legal education and outreach programs, and most grantees visited provided limited community education. Projects responding to a recent Corporation survey indicated increased community legal education efforts were needed but limited resources prevented adequate expansion.

The Corporation became concerned that few of its 300 projects had found the time or resources to conduct legal education or outreach efforts, and initiated efforts to expand the knowledge of effective community legal education techniques among projects.

GRANTEE COMMUNITY LEGAL EDUCATION AND OUTREACH EFFORTS

Of 1,260 eligible poor persons we interviewed in the communities visited, about 60 percent were not aware that free legal services from Corporation projects and other providers were available in the community. Almost half of those who were aware learned of the project from friends rather than as a result of exposure to community legal education efforts. Less than 20 percent of the respondents, or about half of those aware that providers existed, knew the types of legal services offered. The rate of awareness varied significantly among the States and communities, ranging from 4.5 percent to 74 percent, and was generally lower in rural areas. Many who were unaware of the providers in the community had problems that could have been addressed by legal services programs.

Of the nine Corporation grantees visited, seven conducted limited or no community legal education and outreach efforts. Reasons cited by the grantees for not engaging in more community legal education activities included a lack of staffing and resources, concern that increased awareness by the poor would overload the project with requests for service, and

concern that educational programs would take away valuable time from the primary mission of providing legal services. Almost all grantees responding to a Corporation survey discussed on page 21 also cited lack of staffing and resources as reasons for limited community legal education efforts.

In one urban area the Corporation grantee responded to particular speaking requests by ethnic groups but did not ask a non-federally-funded provider that specialized in serving those groups to participate. In the same area, the local bar association occasionally placed spot information announcements on local radio shows concerning available legal services but, because it was unaware of other providers in the area, did not include all of the information which would have been useful to the client community.

Although projects indicated that underfunding and understaffing were the primary reasons for limited community legal education efforts, we visited one Corporation grantee which provided substantial civil legal education to the client community even though its funding level, relative to the poor population, was similar to the average for all Corporation-funded projects. The project offered

- legal education in the public schools for all children in kindergarten through the 12th grade;
- a library of taped information about the law and justice system which operates 24 hours daily and provides basic information concerning 55 areas of the law to any person calling a designated telephone number;
- several pamphlets in English and Spanish concerning various aspects of civil law which are mass distributed to areas of the county designated as poor; and
- a series of lectures before public schools, senior citizens groups, the local bar associations, and others regarding available legal services.

According to the project director, the success of the community education program on a limited budget resulted from proper planning, coordination, and cooperation with community groups, such as the county board of supervisors, the sheriff's department, department of education, and the local bar association.

While some project directors were concerned that expanded community education efforts could increase workloads, the director of the project described above stated that one of the primary objectives of a community education program is to enable potential clients to resolve or avoid some legal problems without the assistance of an attorney. In the director's opinion, a project can thereby expand service to the community without requiring a significant increase in attorney resources. At another project which was in the process of developing a community education program, the director expressed a similar view stating that the major objective was to provide information which would enable some potential clients to avoid or resolve problems on their own and thereby not require assistance from project attorneys.

Responses to the interviews indicated that the level of awareness of available legal services varied significantly among geographic locations, and those residing in rural areas were generally less aware of free legal services projects in their community than those residing in urban areas. However, respondents residing in the rural areas served by a statewide project which maintains close and continuing relationships with the client community reported the highest awareness levels--over 70 percent--of all communities visited. Community awareness was also generally higher in the area served by another grantee which operated a relatively extensive community education program.

CORPORATION EFFORTS

Recognizing the importance of and need for community legal education and outreach activities, the Corporation became concerned that few of its projects had found the time or money to conduct such efforts and initiated a survey to determine what projects were doing. About 30 projects responded to the survey describing ongoing or recent community education programs funded from both Corporation and non-Corporation resources. Twenty other projects indicated they were in the process of initiating new community education programs.

The responses described a number of innovative approaches being employed that would expand community knowledge of legal services. Some methods were being used to reduce demands on project attorneys' time by providing clients with direct information services through telephone law libraries and other educational media, including television, education programs in the schools, pamphlets, and lectures.

Using the responses to its survey, the Corporation compiled and disseminated a directory--which it plans to periodically update--describing the community education efforts and related costs of various projects. Almost all projects included in the directory indicated increased community education efforts were needed but that limited resources prevented adequate expansion of such activities.

To expand the knowledge of effective community education techniques to other projects, the Corporation also conducted a training session to apprise local projects of the methods. Initially, 60 projects expressed an interest in community education and 48 were chosen to participate in the Corporation's first course in June 1978. During the session, the Corporation distributed an interim guide--which it plans to expand--presenting the rationale for and procedures followed by some projects in implementing community education programs. The Corporation plans additional community education activities as interest and need is indicated.

CONCLUSIONS

Community legal education and outreach efforts by Corporation grantees have been limited by unavailability of staffing and resources, and concern over potential impact on demand for service. Knowledge of the availability of free legal services in the community varied significantly among geographic areas and was generally lower in rural areas. Community awareness of legal services projects and available services was generally higher in areas served by grantees with relatively extensive community education programs.

To alleviate imbalances in awareness and ensure equal access to legal services for the poor, increased community education and outreach efforts are needed. Improved community education efforts could enable the poor to resolve some potential legal problems without the services of an attorney, thereby enabling projects to deal with more complex problems and expand outreach efforts by Corporation projects.

RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend that the president of the Legal Services Corporation:

- Expand training sessions on community legal education and require grantees to submit plans for addressing community education with their budget submissions.

--Provide individual projects with needed technical assistance in developing community legal education programs that are suitable to the client community they serve.

CORPORATION COMMENTS

The Corporation agreed with our recommendations and indicated that more than 100 (about one-third) of its grantees are currently conducting community education efforts.

APPENDIX I

APPENDIX I

ESTIMATED NON-CORPORATION FUNDING FOR LEGAL SERVICES

(1977)

SOURCES	LSC-Funded Providers	Non-LSC Funded Providers	TOTAL	Percent of Total
<u>FEDERAL</u>				
HEW				
Title XX, Social Security Act	\$12,814,332	\$ 5,470,446	\$18,284,778	24.1
Administration on Aging	3,304,407	1,997,013	5,301,420	7.0
HUD				
Community Development Block Grant	884,290	206,413	1,090,703	1.4
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR				
Comprehensive Employment and Training Act	3,009,128	1,229,395	4,238,523	5.6
Work Incentive Program	190,437	27,267	217,704	.3
COMMUNITY SERVICES ADMINISTRATION	1,106,311	487,971	1,594,282	2.1
ACTION				
VISTA	447,991	63,570	511,561	.7
TREASURY				
Revenue Sharing	1,036,041	446,464	1,482,505	2.0
JUSTICE				
LEAA	996,339	241,890	1,238,229	1.6
Bureau of Prisons	3,406	-	3,406	-
OTHER FEDERAL				
Civil Legal Services Providers	185,083	488,426	673,509	.9
Civil/Criminal Legal Services Providers	1,276,328	6,451,300	7,727,628	10.2
SUBTOTAL FEDERAL	<u>\$25,254,093</u>	<u>\$17,110,155</u>	<u>\$42,364,248</u>	<u>55.7</u>
<u>NON-FEDERAL</u>				
STATES	3,642,892	1,257,414	4,900,306	6.4
COUNTY/CITY	1,497,477	2,044,623	3,542,100	4.7
OTHER LOCAL	1,354,778	891,453	2,246,231	3.0
CHARITIES	2,944,998	2,419,636	5,364,634	7.1
BAR ASSOCIATION	574,608	281,304	855,912	1.1
COURTS FEES	678,504	1,118,360	1,796,864	2.4
FOUNDATIONS				
National	410,158	644,904	1,045,062	1.4
Local	426,895	395,732	822,627	1.1
PRIVATE DONATIONS	399,276	240,823	640,099	.8
SLIDING SCALE FEE	-	60,923	60,923	.1
OTHER NON-FEDERAL				
Civil Legal Services Providers	202,750	438,605	641,355	.8
Civil/Criminal Legal Services Providers	2,944,898	8,800,000	11,744,898	15.4
SUBTOTAL NON-FEDERAL	<u>\$15,076,246</u>	<u>\$18,583,727</u>	<u>\$33,660,011</u>	<u>44.3</u>
TOTAL	<u>\$40,330,327</u>	<u>\$15,693,932</u>	<u>\$76,024,259</u>	<u>100.0</u>

1 These providers furnish both civil and criminal legal services. Funding estimates shown are for civil legal services only.

LEGEND: HEW - Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
 HUD - Department of Housing and Urban Development
 VISTA - Volunteers in Service to America
 LEAA - Law Enforcement Assistance Administration

RESULTS OF GAO'S NATIONAL
PROVIDER QUESTIONNAIRE[illegible]

I. PROJECT BACKGROUND

1. _____
 (Project name)

 (Address)

 (City) (State) (Zip Code)
 (Area Code) (Telephone Number)

2. Name of official supplying information. _____
 (Name)

 (Title)

3. When was this project first started,
 regardless of what funds were used?

 (Month) (Year)

	LSC PROVIDERS		LSC PROVIDERS		ALL PROVIDERS	
	NUMBER 1/ RESPONDING	RESOURCES 2/ PERCENTAGE	NUMBER 1/ RESPONDING	RESOURCES 2/ PERCENTAGE	NUMBER 1/ RESPONDING	RESOURCES 2/ PERCENTAGE
4. Does this project provide legal services to low income people (as defined by OMB poverty guidelines, LSC income eligibility guidelines or local project guidelines)? (Check one.)	249		200		449	
1- <input type="checkbox"/> Yes (GO TO QUESTION 5)						
2- <input type="checkbox"/> No (STOP!-PLEASE RETURN THE QUESTIONNAIRE IN THE ENVELOPE PROVIDED.)	249	100	200	100	449	100
5. What type of legal problems is this project organized to handle? (Check one.)	249		200		449	
1- <input type="checkbox"/> Criminal only (STOP!-PLEASE RETURN THE QUESTIONNAIRE IN THE ENVELOPE PROVIDED.)						
2- <input type="checkbox"/> Civil only (GO TO QUESTION 6)	232	93.2	138	69.0	370	82.4
3- <input type="checkbox"/> Both criminal and civil (GO TO QUESTION 6) <u>3</u>	17	6.8	62	31.0	79	17.6

	LSC PROVIDERS		NON-LSC PROVIDERS		ALL PROVIDERS	
	NUMBER 1/ RESPONDING	RESPONSES 2/ PERCENTAGE	NUMBER 1/ RESPONDING	RESPONSES 2/ PERCENTAGE	NUMBER 1/ RESPONDING	RESPONSES 2/ PERCENTAGE
6. What types of civil legal problems does this project handle? (Check 1 or 2 and other items as required.)	229		135		364	
1- <u>Generally all types of civil problems with the following exceptions. (Check those which are excluded.)</u>						
11- <u>Name changes</u>	212	92.6	112	83.0	324	89.0
12- <u>Adoptions</u>	26	12.3	10	8.9	36	11.1
13- <u>Uncontested divorces</u>	15	7.1	13	11.6	28	8.6
14- <u>Bankruptcy</u>	11	5.2	8	7.1	19	5.9
15- <u>Incorporations</u>	46	21.7	45	40.2	91	28.1
16- <u>Other (Please specify) _____</u>	41	19.3	63	56.3	104	32.1
	94	44.3	56	50.0	150	46.3
2- <u>Only some types of civil problems. (Check those which apply.)</u>						
21- <u>Housing</u>	17	7.4	23	17.0	40	11.0
22- <u>Consumer problems</u>	13	76.5	11	47.8	24	60.0
23- <u>Family or domestic affairs</u>	13	76.5	5	21.7	18	45.0
24- <u>Administrative/Government benefits</u>	8	47.1	9	39.1	17	42.5
25- <u>Employment discrimination</u>	15	88.2	6	26.1	21	52.5
26- <u>Other (Please specify) _____</u>	10	58.8	5	21.7	15	37.5
	12	70.6	14	60.9	26	65.0

7. What geographic area is served by this project? (Check one.)		LSC PROVIDERS		NON-LSC PROVIDERS		ALL PROVIDERS	
		NUMBER 1/ RESPONDING	RESPONSES 2/ PERCENTAGE	NUMBER 1/ RESPONDING	RESPONSES 2/ PERCENTAGE	NUMBER 1/ RESPONDING	RESPONSES 2/ PERCENTAGE
1- <input type="checkbox"/>	Only part of a city-a neighborhood/community/block/specific population	0	0	2	1.5	2	.5
2- <input type="checkbox"/>	Entire city	6	2.6	13	9.6	19	5.2
3- <input type="checkbox"/>	One county	102	44.3	82	60.3	184	50.3
4- <input type="checkbox"/>	Multi-county	91	39.6	20	14.7	111	30.3
5- <input type="checkbox"/>	State wide	18	7.8	9	6.6	27	7.4
6- <input type="checkbox"/>	Other (Please specify) _____	13	5.7	10	7.4	23	6.3
		230		136		366	

APPENDIX II

II. STAFFING

8. For each job position in your project:

- (1) List the job title.
- (2) Indicate by number whether the job is filled by (1) an attorney, (2) a paralegal, (3) an investigator, (4) a law student, (5) a manager, or (6) a clerical worker.
- (3) Indicate current annual salary (annualized if position is seasonal or part-time)- enter "v" if voluntary.
- (4) If position is seasonal or part-time, indicate percentage of year worked.
- (5) Indicate amount of Legal Services Corporation (LSC) funds allocated to total annual salary.
- (6) Indicate amount of Non-LSC funds allocated to total annual salary.
- (7) Specify the source of funds indicated in (6) (e.g., RHS Fellowship (Reggie), VISTA, CETA, etc.)

29

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Job Title	Position Type	Current Annual Salary	% of Year Worked	LSC Funds	Non-LSC Funds	Source of Non-LSC Funds

LSC PROVIDERS

POSITION TYPE	NUMBER OF PROJECTS WITH	PERCENTAGE OF PROJECTS WITH	NUMBER OF POSITIONS	TOTAL SALARY	YEARS WORKED	AVERAGE ANNUAL SALARY	LSC FUNDS	NON-LSC FUNDS	NUMBER OF VOLUNTEER POSITIONS	VOLUNTEER YEARS WORKED
1 ATTORNEY	227	100.0	2,933	\$42,921,760	2,895.0	\$14,826	\$28,655,450	\$13,925,218	146	80.1
2 PARALEGAL	189	83.3	1,152	9,388,230	1,097.8	8,552	4,709,034	4,421,847	72	34.3
3 INVESTIGATOR	24	10.6	93	764,308	92.3	8,278	542,752	216,824	12	6.5
4 LAW STUDENT	71	31.3	299	1,658,888	178.6	9,287	654,550	379,977	170	44.8
5 MANAGER	114	50.2	191	2,463,355	184.2	13,375	1,783,260	637,917	1	1.0
6 CLERICAL WORK	219	96.5	2,210	16,596,061	2,118.0	7,836	11,501,042	4,652,982	53	18.9
7 OTHER	34	15.0	137	1,192,044	122.3	9,748	860,050	231,188	14	1.3

APPENDIX II

NON-LSC PROVIDERS

POSITION TYPE	NUMBER OF PROJECTS WITH	PERCENTAGE OF PROJECTS WITH	NUMBER OF POSITIONS	TOTAL SALARY	YEARS WORKED	AVERAGE ANNUAL SALARY	LSC FUNDS	NON-LSC FUNDS	NUMBER OF VOLUNTEER POSITIONS	VOLUNTEER YEARS WORKED
1 ATTORNEY	111	90.2	371	\$ 5,640,765	345.4	\$16,332	0	\$ 5,273,636	266	31.9
2 PARALEGAL	52	42.3	111	916,775	97.4	9,412	0	817,665	10	6.8
3 INVESTIGATOR	3	2.4	7	76,860	7.0	10,980	0	76,860	0	.0
4 LAW STUDENT	17	13.8	60	213,790	26.5	8,065	0	150,808	635	279.6
5 MANAGER	21	17.1	28	292,576	27.5	10,639	0	279,748	0	.0
6 CLERICAL WORK	98	79.7	263	1,891,036	242.2	7,809	0	1,892,262	16	5.7
7 OTHER ^{4/}	5	4.1	23	247,600	23.0	10,765	0	247,600	4	1.0
ALL PROVIDERS										
1 ATTORNEY	338	96.6	3,304	\$ 48,562,525	3,240.4	\$14,986	\$28,655,450	\$19,198,854	412	112.0
2 PARALEGAL	241	68.9	1,263	10,305,005	1,195.2	8,622	4,709,034	5,239,512	82	41.1
3 INVESTIGATOR	27	7.7	100	841,168	99.3	8,468	542,752	293,684	12	6.5
4 LAW STUDENT	88	25.1	359	1,872,678	205.1	9,129	654,550	530,785	805	324.5
5 MANAGER	135	38.6	219	2,755,931	211.7	13,019	1,783,260	917,665	1	1.0
6 CLERICAL WORK	317	90.6	2,473	18,487,097	2,360.2	7,833	11,509,064	6,537,222	69	24.6
7 OTHER ^{4/}	39	11.1	160	1,439,644	145.3	9,909	860,050	478,788	18	2.3

	LSC PROVIDERS		NON-LSC PROVIDERS		ALL PROVIDERS	
	NUMBER 1/ RESPONDING	RESPONSES 2/ PERCENTAGE	NUMBER 1/ RESPONDING	RESPONSES 2/ PERCENTAGE	NUMBER 1/ RESPONDING	RESPONSES 2/ PERCENTAGE
231	231		134		365	
3	3	1.3	21	15.7	24	6.6
228	228	98.7	113	84.3	341	93.4
227	227		112		339	
143	143	63.0	88	78.6	231	68.1
68	68	30.0	19	17.0	87	25.7
11	11	4.8	4	3.6	15	4.4
5	5	2.2	1	.9	6	1.8

III CLIENTS

9.-1 How many sets of income standards does your project have to determine eligibility for services (e.g., one for community in general, one for elderly, etc.)? (Check 1 or 2 and other items as required.)

1- — None—all residents of the community are eligible (GO TO QUESTION 16)

2- — income standards

9.-2 Number of income standards:

1

2

3

4

APPENDIX II

APPENDIX II

	LSC PROVIDERS			NON-LSC PROVIDERS			ALL PROVIDERS		
	NUMBER 1/ RESPONDING	RESPONSES 2/ NUMBER	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER 1/ RESPONDING	RESPONSES 2/ NUMBER	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER 1/ RESPONDING	RESPONSES 2/ NUMBER	PERCENTAGE
10. For each income standard that you have specify the annual income limit for each family size.									
11. Does your project include considerations other than income in determining eligibility for services? (Check one.)	225			114			339		
1- Yes (GO TO QUESTION 12)	196	87.1		95	83.3		291	85.8	
2- No (GO TO QUESTION 13)	29	12.9		19	16.7		48	14.2	
12. Indicate those additional considerations which are included (Check those which apply.)	195			94			289		
1- Age	87	44.6		35	37.2		122	42.2	
2- Extraordinary medical costs	145	74.4		48	51.1		193	66.8	
3- Child care	88	45.1		29	30.9		117	40.5	
4- Transportation	57	29.2		12	12.8		69	23.9	
5- Other (Please specify) _____	154	79.0		63	67.0		217	75.1	

Data obtained was insufficient for analysis.

APPENDIX II

	LSC PROVIDERS		NON-LSC PROVIDERS		ALL PROVIDERS	
	NUMBER 1/ RESPONDING	RESPONSES 2/ NUMBER PERCENTAGE	NUMBER 1/ RESPONDING	RESPONSES 2/ NUMBER PERCENTAGE	NUMBER 1/ RESPONDING	RESPONSES 2/ NUMBER PERCENTAGE
13. Are the income standards listed in Question 10 gross or net income? (Check one box for each standard you have.)	220		103		323	
GROSS	173	56.2	73	56.6	246	56.3
NET	135	43.8	56	43.4	191	43.7
TOTAL	308	100.0	129	100.0	437	100.0

33

14. Are cost of living adjustments made to these standards? (Check one box for each standard you have.)	218		99		317	
YES	95	31.0	31	24.6	126	29.2
NO	211	69.0	95	75.4	306	70.8
TOTAL	306	100.0	126	100.0	432	100.0
15. Do you believe cost of living adjustments should be incorporated on your income standards? (Check one box for each stand- ard you have).	214		98		312	
YES	252	84.0	103	81.7	355	83.3
NO	48	16.0	23	18.3	71	16.7
TOTAL	300	100.0	126	100.0	426	100.0

APPENDIX II

	LSC PROVIDERS		NON-LSC PROVIDERS		ALL PROVIDERS	
	NUMBER 17	RESPONSES 2/ PERCENTAGE	NUMBER 17	RESPONSES 2/ PERCENTAGE	NUMBER RESPONDING	RESPONSES 2/ PERCENTAGE
16. For which of the following groups, if any, does your project have a program and/or receive monies specifically earmarked to handle legal problems? (Check those which apply.)	227		134		361	
1- Elderly	107	47.1	24	17.9	131	36.3
2- Juveniles	17	7.5	4	3.0	21	5.8
3- Prisoners	13	5.7	4	3.0	17	4.7
4- American Indians	7	3.1	1	.7	8	2.2
5- Mentally hospitalized	20	8.3	3	2.2	23	6.4
6- Hospitalized in general	0	0	1	.7	1	.3
7- Disabled	11	4.8	5	3.7	16	4.4
8- Unemployed	6	2.6	3	2.2	9	2.5
9- Migrants	20	8.8	0	0	20	5.5
10- Immigrants	4	1.8	3	2.2	7	1.9
11- Other special group(s) (Please specify _____)	36	15.9	16	11.9	52	14.4
12- There is no program and/or money for any specific group.	89	39.2	86	64.2	175	48.5

	LSC PROVIDERS		NON-LSC PROVIDERS		ALL PROVIDERS	
	NUMBER RESPONDING	1/ RESPONSES PERCENTAGE	NUMBER RESPONDING	1/ RESPONSES PERCENTAGE	NUMBER RESPONDING	1/ RESPONSES PERCENTAGE
17. Do you charge fees for any of your services? (Check those which apply.)	228		134		362	
1- <input type="checkbox"/> No, all services are free to all that meet the income standard	223	97.8	103	76.9	326	50.1
2- <input type="checkbox"/> No, all services are free to all in the community.	3	1.3	10	7.5	13	3.6
3- <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, a sliding scale fee is used in conjunction with the income standard for some types of clients	0	0	3	2.2	3	.8
4- <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, a sliding scale fee is used in conjunction with the income standard for some types of cases	0	0	0	0	0	0
5- <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, some other judgment of ability to pay is used (Please specify) _____	4	1.8	18	13.4	22	6.1

APPENDIX II

	LSC PROVIDERS			NON LSC PROVIDERS			ALL PROVIDERS		
	NUMBER 1/ RESPONDING	RESPONSES 2/ PERCENTAGE		NUMBER 1/ RESPONDING	RESPONSES 2/ PERCENTAGE		NUMBER 1/ RESPONDING	RESPONSES 2/ PERCENTAGE	

18. Please estimate how many people in the geographic area of concern to you are eligible (meeting financial and type of client criteria) for your services?

1- About _____ people
(GO TO QUESTION 19)

2- Have no idea
(GO TO QUESTION 20)

366

78.4

21.6

19. On what basis did you estimate the answer given in Question 18? (Check one.) 5/

1- Judgment

2- A survey by _____

3- Census data

4- Other (Please specify) _____

213

71

284

19.4

13.7

70.8

18.0

20. Have you or anyone in the community conducted a needs assessment survey to determine civil legal needs of the poor in your community? (Check one.)

1- Yes (GO TO QUESTION 21)

2- No (GO TO QUESTION 24)

3- Don't know (GO TO QUESTION 24)

228

136

364

17.9

59.3

22.8

APPENDIX II

LSC PROVIDERS			NON-LSC PROVIDERS			ALL PROVIDERS		
NUMBER	1/	RESPONSES 2/	NUMBER	1/	RESPONSES 2/	NUMBER	1/	RESPONSES 2/
RESPONDING	NUMBER	PERCENTAGE	RESPONDING	NUMBER	PERCENTAGE	RESPONDING	NUMBER	PERCENTAGE
38			14			52		
	10	26.3		1	7.1		11	21.2
	15	39.5		6	42.9		21	40.4
	5	13.2		3	21.4		8	15.4
	8	21.1		4	28.6		12	23.1

21. When was this survey done?

22. Who performed this survey?

23. According to the survey report what percent of those people eligible for services are in need of civil legal services each year? (Check one.)

41

18

5.
5.

1- The report of the survey mentioned in Question 20 indicates about %

2-____ The survey report did not include this information.

3- Don't know

11.9

7

54.2

32

33.9

07

33.9

07

11.1

2

11.1

2

44.4

44.4

44.4

8

44.4

8

IV. CASES

24. Please specify what annual period of time you use to record data about your cases. (check one.)

1- Fiscal year (e.g., FY1976: 7/1/75-6/30/76)

Starting date of last FY completed

Ending date of last FY completed

2- Calendar year (e.g., CY1975: 1/1/75-12/31/75)

3- Recording year (e.g., 4/1/75-3/31/76) Starting date of last recording year completed

Ending date of last recording year completed

LSC PROVIDERS				BOTH LSC PROVIDERS				ALL PROVIDERS			
NUMBER 1/		RESPONSES 2/		NUMBER 1/		RESPONSES 2/		NUMBER 1/		RESPONSES 2/	
RESPONDING		NUMBER		RESPONDING		NUMBER		RESPONDING		NUMBER	
		PERCENTAGE				PERCENTAGE				PERCENTAGE	
216				127				343			
59		27.3		48		37.8		107		31.2	
143		66.2		64		50.4		207		60.3	
14		6.5		15		11.8		29		8.5	

	LSC PROVIDERS			NONLSC PROVIDERS			ALL PROVIDERS		
	NUMBER RESPONDING	RESPONSES RANGED FROM AVERAGE		NUMBER RESPONDING	RESPONSES RANGED FROM AVERAGE		NUMBER RESPONDING	RESPONSES RANGED FROM AVERAGE	
		0 to	IS		0 to	IS		0 to	IS
25. Listed below are a number of services which you can perform. For the problems handled by your project during your last fiscal or recording year <u>estimate</u> what percent of the problems you re-solved by using each of the following. (Total should equal 100%)	200			102			302		
(1) Referral to another attorney or project _____%		72%	9.3%		70%	11.7%		72%	10.1%
(2) Handled the problem solely by counseling on the phone _____%		35%	3.7%		60%	6.8%		60%	4.8%
(3) Handled the problem by advice only-counseling the client in the office and/or telephoning one or more times on behalf of the client and/or writing one or more letters on behalf of the client _____%		70%	30.3%		75.6/	26.7%		75%	29.1%
(4) Handled the problem by negotiating a settlement at an out of court meeting on behalf of the client _____%		51%	17.0%		42%	13.9%		51%	15.9%
(5) Handled the problem by appearing at an administrative hearing on behalf of the client _____%		70%	11.5%		75%	8.6%		75%	10.5%
(6) Handled the problem by appearing in court on behalf of client _____%		60%	20.7%		80%	25.4%		80%	22.3%

	LSC PROVIDERS			NONLSC PROVIDERS			ALL PROVIDERS		
	NUMBER RESPONDING	RANGED FROM 0 to	RESPONSES AVERAGE IS	NUMBER RESPONDING	RANGED FROM 0 to	RESPONSES AVERAGE IS	NUMBER RESPONDING	RANGED FROM 0 to	RESPONSES AVERAGE IS
(7) Referral to a non-legal agency	___%	30%	4.8%	22%	22%	4.7%	30%	30%	4.7%
(8) Legislative representation	___%	20%	.8%	15%	15%	.7%	20%	20%	.7%
(9) Other (Please specify.)	___%	75%	2.1%	26%	26%	1.6%	75%	75%	1.9%
TOTAL	100%		198.0%			100.0%			100.0%

	NUMBER RESPONDING	TOTAL CASES	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL CASES	NUMBER RESPONDING	TOTAL CASES	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL CASES	NUMBER RESPONDING	TOTAL CASES	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL CASES
27. How many cases of each of the following types has the project handled during the last fiscal or recording year? (use time period mentioned in Question 24)	205			105			310		
Number of cases									
(1) Housing		106,874	13.9		16,586	11.4		123,460	13.5
(2) Consumer problems		106,707	13.9		15,608	10.7		122,315	13.4
(3) Family or domestic affairs		233,250	30.3		69,026	47.4		302,276	33.0
(4) Administrative/ government benefits		141,296	18.4		13,444	9.2		154,740	16.9
(5) Employment discrimination		6,894	.9		1,811	1.2		8,705	1.0
(6) Other (Please specify) 7/		174,459	22.6		28,970	2.0		203,429	22.2
TOTAL		769,480	100.0		145,445	100.0		914,925	100.0

APPENDIX II

APPENDIX II

	LSC PROVIDERS			NON-LSC PROVIDERS			ALL PROVIDERS		
	NUMBER RESPONDING	NUMBER 1/	RESPONSES 2/ PERCENTAGE	NUMBER RESPONDING	NUMBER 1/	RESPONSES 2/ PERCENTAGE	NUMBER RESPONDING	NUMBER 1/	RESPONSES 2/ PERCENTAGE
28. What criteria do you use in accepting new cases? (Check those which apply.)	225			134			359		
1- First come, first served		138	61.3 ^{8/}		76	56.7		214	59.6
2- Serve those first who have had their cases handled by project before		5	2.2		8	6.0		13	3.6
3- Those least able to afford services come first		46	20.4		17	12.7		63	17.5
4- A case by case determination is made to determine if the emotional well-being of the client is threatened by his/her problem		37	16.4		30	22.4		67	18.7
5- The various problem areas have been ranked in order of seriousness. This is used to guide us in determining what to accept		107	47.6		31	23.1		138	38.4
6- Other (Please specify) _____		47	20.9		34	25.4		81	22.6
29. Who sets the criteria for determining acceptance (Check those which apply.)	224			131			355		
1- Specified by board of directors		148	66.1		79	60.3		227	63.9
2- Specified by funding source		96	42.9		35	26.7		131	36.9
3- Other (Please specify) _____		85	37.9		49	37.4		134	37.7

30. During each of your last three fiscal or recording years, how many court cases have resulted in the following outcomes?

Outcome	(1) Latest	(2) Second Latest	(3) Third Latest
(1) Client objective substantially obtained			
(2) Client objective somewhat obtained			
(3) Client objective not obtained			

OUTCOME	LSC PROVIDERS		NON-LSC PROVIDERS		ALL PROVIDERS	
	Number of Projects Responding	Number of Cases	Number of Projects Responding	Number of Cases	Number of Projects Responding	Number of Cases
(1) Client objective substantially obtained	109	62,079	38	5,079	147	67
(2) Client objective somewhat obtained	98	26,476	36	1,876	134	28,352
(3) Client objective not obtained	105	14,317	36	932	141	15,249
SECOND LATEST YEAR						
(1) Client objective substantially obtained	83	47,055	18	1,514	101	44,529
(2) Client objective somewhat obtained	75	18,571	16	959	91	19,530
(3) Client objective not obtained	80	11,209	17	494	97	11,703

THIRD LATEST YEAR					
(1) Client objective substan- tially obtained	78	36,667	14	825	92
					37,492
(2) Client objective somewhat obtained	69	14,451	12	903	81
					15,354
(3) Client objective not obtained	75	8,754	13	348	88
					9,102

	LSC PROVIDERS		NON-LSC PROVIDERS		ALL PROVIDERS	
	Number of Projects Responding	Number of Cases	Number of Projects Responding	Number of Cases	Number of Projects Responding	Number of Cases
31. During each of your last three fiscal or recording years, how many cases have been settled without court action?						
(1) Latest year	117	191,102	43	30,940	160	222,042
(2) Second Latest year	93	147,786	24	26,116	117	173,902
(3) Third Latest year	81	103,406	19	18,485	100	121,891

	LSC PROVIDERS		NON-LSC PROVIDERS		ALL PROVIDERS	
	NUMBER 1/ RESPONDING	RESPONSES 2/ PERCENTAGE	NUMBER 1/ RESPONDING	RESPONSES 2/ PERCENTAGE	NUMBER 1/ RESPONDING	RESPONSES 2/ PERCENTAGE
32. How many class action cases did you have in process during your last fiscal or recording year?	Cases		120		312	
0						
1		30.7	96	80.0	155	49.7
2		8.3	9	7.5	25	8.0
3		12.5	4	3.3	28	9.0
4		7.3	0	0	14	4.5
5		6.3	0	0	12	3.8
6-8		5.7	5	4.2	16	5.1
9-11		6.8	1	.8	14	4.5
12-18		5.2	0	0	10	3.2
19-25		5.7	1	.8	12	3.8
OVER 25		6.2	2	1.6	14	4.4
		5.0	2	1.6	12	3.6

32. How many class action cases did you have in process during your last fiscal or recording year?

33. About how many people were represented, in total, in all of your class action cases during your last fiscal or recording year?

People

Data obtained was insufficient for analysis.

V. RESOURCES

This section deals with resources provided to your project-both financial and service oriented resources. Many of the questions will ask you to identify the sources which provide you with such funds or services.

34. Listed below are a number of sources which could currently be providing funds or services to your project. Please check those sources which are doing so and add any to the list which are not mentioned. Subsequent questions concerning the use of the resources will ask you to identify by number the sources which provided the various resources. Please be sure the correct number is used in each case.

Source	LSC PROVIDERS			NON-LSC PROVIDERS			ALL PROVIDERS		
	NUMBER RESPONDING	NUMBER 1/ 232	PERCENTAGE 2/ 232	NUMBER RESPONDING	NUMBER 1/ 135	PERCENTAGE 2/ 135	NUMBER RESPONDING	NUMBER 1/ 367	PERCENTAGE 2/ 367
1- Legal Services Corporation	232		100.0	0		0	232		63.2
2- Title XX, Social Security Act	65		28.0	34		25.2	99		27.0
3- Title IV, Social Security Act	0		0	0		0	0		0
4- Administration on Aging	77		33.2	12		8.9	89		24.3
5- Community Development/HUD	22		9.5	6		4.4	28		7.6
6- Community Services Administration	26		11.2	9		6.7	35		9.5
7- Civil Service Commission/EEOC	0		0	0		0	0		0
8- Bureau of Prisons	1		.4	0		0	1		.3
9- LEAA	11		4.7	1		.7	12		3.3
10- VISTA	82		35.3	14		10.4	96		26.2
11- WIN (Work Incentive)	24		10.3	4		3.0	28		7.6
12- UETA	130		56.0	41		30.4	171		46.6
13- Revenue Sharing	23		9.9	13		9.6	36		9.8
14- State funds	30		12.9	12		8.9	42		11.4
15- County Government	50		21.6	40		29.6	90		24.5
16- City Government	20		8.6	16		11.9	36		9.8
17- United Way	78		33.6	35		25.9	113		30.8
18- Community Fund or Trust	5		2.2	4		3.0	9		2.5
19- Bar Association	64		27.6	42		31.1	106		28.9
20- Court fees	31		13.4	26		19.3	57		15.5

	LSC PROVIDERS			NON-LSC PROVIDERS			ALL PROVIDERS		
	NUMBER 1/ RESPONDING	NUMBER	RESPONSES 2/ PERCENTAGE	NUMBER 1/ RESPONDING	NUMBER	RESPONSES 2/ PERCENTAGE	NUMBER 1/ RESPONDING	NUMBER	RESPONSES 2/ PERCENTAGE
21- Sliding scale fee		0	0		5	3.7		5	1.4
22- Foundations-national (Please specify)		14	6.0		6	4.4		20	5.4
23- Foundations-local (Please specify)		19	8.2		17	12.6		36	9.8
24- Private citizens		37	15.9		21	15.6		58	15.8
25- Other-local sources(Please specify)		38	16.4		26	19.3		64	17.4
26- Other-state sources (Please specify)		18	7.8		3	2.2		21	5.7
27- Other-federal sources (Please specify)		24	10.3		8	5.9		32	8.7
28- Other sources (Please specify)		30	12.9		27	20.0		57	15.5

35. What are the starting and ending dates of your current fiscal year?

Start: (Month) (Day) (Year)

End: (Month) (Day) (Year)

	LSC PROVIDERS		NON-LSC PROVIDERS		ALL PROVIDERS	
	NUMBER RESPONDING	TOTAL BUDGET	NUMBER RESPONDING	TOTAL BUDGET	NUMBER RESPONDING	TOTAL BUDGET
(1) Latest Year (current)	219	\$ 111,171,157	111	\$ 11,886,377	330	\$ 123,057,534
(2) Second Latest Year	190	78,768,006	87	8,676,540	277	87,444,546
(3) Third Latest Year	178	65,745,391	67	5,810,959	245	71,556,350

36. What was your total budget for civil legal services for each of your last three fiscal years?

(1) Latest Year (current)

(2) Second Latest Year

(3) Third Latest Year

37. For each source that you have marked in Question 36, indicate:

(1) The source number

(2) The amount of funds being provided by each source during your current fiscal year.

(3) The estimated dollar equivalent of any services (e.g. volunteers) being provided during your current fiscal year.

SOURCE	LSC PROVIDERS			NON-LSC PROVIDERS			ALL PROVIDERS		
	FUNDS PROVIDED	DOLLAR EQUIVALENT OF SERVICES		FUNDS PROVIDED	DOLLAR EQUIVALENT OF SERVICES		FUNDS PROVIDED	DOLLAR EQUIVALENT OF SERVICES	
Legal Services Corporation	\$ 83,571,328	\$ 420,073		\$ 0	\$ 0		\$ 83,571,328	\$ 420,073	
Title XX, Social Security Act	11,286,481	61,000		2,968,274	30,200		14,254,755	91,200	
Title IV, Social Security Act	0	0		0	0		0	0	
Administration on Aging	2,910,423	98,178		1,083,583	2,000		3,994,006	100,178	
Community Development/RUD	778,856	0		112,000	3,000		890,856	3,000	
Community Services Administration	879,406	22,188		264,774	0		1,144,180	22,188	
Civil Service Commission/EEOC	0	0		0	0		0	0	
Bureau of Prisons	3,000	0		0	0		3,000	0	
LEAA	712,546	0		131,250	0		843,796	0	
VISTA	393,177	1,991,584		34,493	64,500		427,670	2,056,084	
WIN (Work Incentive)	167,731	67,566		14,795	0		182,526	67,566	
CETA	2,548,350	477,103		667,072	35,152		3,215,422	512,255	
Revenue Sharing	912,514	8,000		242,252	1,000		1,154,766	9,000	
State funds	2,559,724	14,914		641,334	0		3,201,058	14,914	
County Government	991,661	73,307		920,168	42,805		1,911,829	116,112	
City Government	327,272	3,600		189,248	24,007		516,520	27,607	
United Way	2,507,155	0		856,157	15,000		3,363,312	15,000	
Community Fund or Trust	86,711	0		456,742	0		543,453	0	
Bar Association	504,098	660,515		152,636	756,900		656,734	1,417,415 ^{9/}	
Court Fees	597,606	28,000		606,824	1,100		1,204,430	29,100	
Sliding Scale Fee	0	0		33,057	250		33,057	250	

APPENDIX II

APPENDIX II

[illegible]

	LSC PROVIDERS			NON-LSC PROVIDERS			ALL PROVIDERS		
	NUMBER OF PROJECTS	FUNDS	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL	NUMBER OF PROJECTS	FUNDS	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL	NUMBER OF PROJECTS	FUNDS	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL
38. For each source of funding or services, what are the program limitations which are placed on how the resources can be used? (Next to each limitation statement place the source numbers which apply. If all sources fall in one category, enter "ALL" in the box.)									
Limitations									
Source									
(Insert numbers)									
(1) ESSENTIALLY NO LIMITATIONS ON CIVIL PROBLEMS	196	\$ 90,946,280	\$9.810/	82	\$ 6,337,279	52.6	278	\$ 97,283,559	85.8
Use is limited to:									
(2) Housing problems	14	1,036,276	1.0	7	464,705	3.9	21	1,500,981	1.3
(3) Consumer problems	8	308,010	.8	5	443,228	3.7	13	1,251,238	1.1
(4) Family or domestic affairs problems	11	979,994	1.0	6	241,631	2.0	17	1,221,675	1.1
5) Administrative/ government benefit problems	10	1,416,349	1.4	6	446,402	3.7	16	1,862,751	1.6
(6) Employment discrimination problems	2	31,242	0	4	386,546	3.2	6	417,788	.4
(7) Client education/ awareness of legal problems	9	1,008,066	1.0	3	229,979	1.9	12	1,238,045	1.1

	LSC PROVIDERS			NON-LSC PROVIDERS			ALL PROVIDERS		
	NUMBER OF PROJECTS	FUNDS	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL	NUMBER OF PROJECTS	FUNDS	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL	NUMBER OF PROJECTS	FUNDS	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL
(3) Other (Please specify)	47	\$ 3,626,383	3.6	9	\$ 445,552	3.7	56	\$ 4,071,937	3.6
(9) (Please specify)	23	1,049,337	1.0	5	2,924,909	24.3	28	3,973,246	3.5
(10) (Please specify)	4	417,433	.4	1	123,513	1.0	5	540,996	.5
TOTAL		<u>\$101,318,422</u>	100.0		<u>\$12,043,794</u>	100.0		<u>\$113,362,216</u>	100.0

	LSC PROVIDERS			NON-LSC PROVIDERS			ALL PROVIDERS		
	NUMBER OF PROJECTS	FUNDS	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL	NUMBER OF PROJ-CTS	FUNDS	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL	NUMBER OF PROJECTS	FUNDS	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL
39. For each source of funding or services, what are the client eligibility limitations which are placed on how the resources can be used? (Next to each limitation statement place the source numbers which apply. If all sources fall in one category, enter "ALL" in the box.)									
	193	\$79,098,221	85.411/	95	\$ 7,476,611	60.0	278	\$ 86,574,832	82.5
(1) ESSENTIALLY NO LIMITATIONS EXCEPT BEING POOR									
Use is limited to:									
(2) Welfare recipients	16	2,463,553	2.7	5	1,421,293	11.6	21	3,884,851	3.7
(3) Elderly	67	3,228,432	3.5	13	1,408,604	11.5	80	4,637,036	4.4
(4) Juveniles	13	785,553	.8	4	518,050	4.2	17	1,303,608	1.2
(5) Prisoners	8	1,436,363	1.6	2	140,000	1.1	10	1,626,363	1.6
(6) American Indians	2	247,900	.3	2	128,261	1.0	4	376,161	.4
(7) Mentally hospitalized	11	1,255,560	1.4	2	155,319	1.3	13	1,411,379	1.3
(8) Hospitalized in general	2	261,900	.3	1	85,835	.7	3	347,735	.5
(9) Disabled	5	546,435	.6	1	120,835	1.0	6	667,270	.6
(10) Unemployed	3	551,900	.6	1	120,835	1.0	4	672,735	.6
(11) Migrants	5	1,669,805	1.8	2	132,739	1.0	7	1,802,544	1.7
(12) Immigrants	3	288,653	.3	0	0	0	3	288,653	.3
(13) Other special group(s) (please specify)	11	755,868	.8	7	566,563	4.6	18	1,322,431	1.3
TOTAL		\$92,640,153	100.0		\$12,275,445	100.0		\$104,915,598	100.0

LSC PROVIDERS				NCL-ESC PROVIDERS				ALL PROVIDERS			
NUMBER OF PROJECTS	FUNDS	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL	NUMBER OF PROJECTS	FUNDS	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL	NUMBER OF PROJECTS	FUNDS	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL			
210	\$89,234,846	95.1	100	\$10,933,600	96.8	310	\$100,868,450	95.3			
51	<u>4,615,655</u>	<u>4.9</u>	9	<u>360,472</u>	<u>3.2</u>	50	<u>4,976,127</u>	<u>4.7</u>			
	\$94,550,501	100.0		\$11,294,072	100.0		\$105,844,577	100.0			

40. For each source of funding, or services, what are the geographic limitations which are placed on the use of the resources? (Next to each limitation statement place the source numbers which apply. If all sources fall in one category, enter "ALL" in the box.)

Sources
(Insert numbers)

(1) NO LIMITATION WITHIN THE GEOGRAPHIC AREA BEING SERVED BY THE PROJECT

(2) Use is limited to an area smaller than that served by the project

TOTAL

	LSC PROVIDERS			NON-LSC PROVIDERS			ALL PROVIDERS		
	NUMBER OF PROJECTS	FUNDS	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL	NUMBER OF PROJECTS	FUNDS	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL	NUMBER OF PROJECTS	FUNDS	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL
199	86,831,174	91.1	85	9,806,767	82.0	284	96,637,941	90.0	
35	3,756,266	3.9	21	938,149	7.8	56	4,694,415	4.4	
49	2,191,637	2.3	26	750,640	6.3	75	2,942,277	2.7	
22	2,586,033	2.7	16	464,522	3.9	38	3,050,555	2.8	
	<u>\$95,365,110</u>	<u>100.0</u>		<u>\$11,960,078</u>	<u>100.0</u>		<u>\$107,325,188</u>	<u>100.0</u>	

41. For each source of funding or services, what did you have to do to obtain the resources? (Next to each statement place the source numbers which apply. If all sources fall in one category, enter "All" in the box.)

Sources
(Insert numbers)

- (1) Submit proposal and statement of need
- (2) Submit statement of need only
- (3) Resources granted without formal application
- (4) Other (Please specify)

TOTAL

	LSC PROVIDERS			NON-LSC PROVIDERS			ALL PROVIDERS		
	NUMBER OF PROJECTS	FUNDS	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL	NUMBER OF PROJECTS	FUNDS	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL	NUMBER OF PROJECTS	FUNDS	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL
15	15	\$16,355,992	17.0	90	\$ 5,322,908	48.8	24.8	\$ 21,678,900	20.2
36	36	13,691,069	14.2	38	4,621,797	42.4	124	18,312,866	17.1
190	190	66,127,763	68.8	16	959,581	8.8	206	67,087,344	62.7
TOTAL		\$96,174,824	100.0		\$10,904,286	100.0		\$107,079,110	100.0

42. For each source of funding or services, was the decision to grant the resources to your project made locally or nationally by the funding source? (Text to each place the source numbers which apply. If all sources fall in one category, enter "ALL" in the box.)

Sources
(Insert Numbers)

- (1) Local decision
(2) State decision
(3) National decision

43. For each source of funding of services, how stable are the resources being provided? (Text to each statement place the source numbers which apply. If all sources fall in one category, enter "ALL" in the box.)

Sources
(Insert number)

- (1) Likely to end this fiscal or reporting year
(2) Likely to continue for another year
(3) Likely to continue for 2 years
(4) Likely to continue for 3 years or more
(5) Don't know

94	94	\$ 5,008,444	5.4	34	\$ 1,039,436	8.3	128	\$ 6,047,880	5.7
91	91	12,460,964	13.4	44	3,482,930	27.7	135	15,943,894	15.1
24	24	3,689,502	4.0	15	3,794,222	30.1	39	7,483,724	7.1
149	149	58,093,189	62.6	41	3,155,245	25.1	190	61,248,434	58.1
66	66	13,599,368	14.6	26	1,113,174	8.8	92	14,712,542	14.0
TOTAL		\$92,851,467	100.0	13/	\$12,585,907	100.0		\$105,436,474	100.0

	LSC PROVIDERS			NON-LSC PROVIDERS			ALL PROVIDERS		
	NUMBER OF PROJECTS	FUNDS	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL	NUMBER OF PROJECTS	FUNDS	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL	NUMBER OF PROJECTS	FUNDS	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL
44. For each source of funding or services, what would be the impact on the existing legal service program if resources from the source were lost? (Next to each statement place the source numbers which apply. If all sources fall in one category, enter "ALL" in the box.)									
Sources (Insert numbers)									
(1) Would not impact on existing services	44	\$ 1,242,787	1.2	15	\$ 181,181	1.5	59	\$ 1,423,968	1.2
(2) Somewhat curtail service	93	2,958,695	2.7	35	641,723	5.4	128	3,600,418	3.0
(3) Greatly curtail services	87	19,457,646	18.1	33	2,780,946	23.4	120	22,238,592	18.6
(4) Eliminate some services	104	15,517,191	14.4	24	915,405	7.7	128	16,432,596	13.7
(5) Eliminate all services	146	68,551,771	63.6	71	7,342,539	61.9	217	75,894,310	63.5
TOTAL		\$107,728,090	100.0		\$11,861,794	100.0		\$119,589,884	100.0

44. For each source of funding or services, what would be the impact on the existing legal service program if resources from the source were lost? (Next to each statement place the source numbers which apply. If all sources fall in one category, enter "ALL" in the box.)

Sources
(Insert numbers)

(1) Would not impact on existing services

(2) Somewhat curtail service

(3) Greatly curtail services

(4) Eliminate some services

(5) Eliminate all services

LSC PROVIDERS				NON-LSC PROVIDERS				ALL PROVIDERS			
NUMBER OF PROJECTS	FUNDS	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL	NUMBER OF PROJECTS	FUNDS	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL	NUMBER OF PROJECTS	FUNDS	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL	NUMBER OF PROJECTS	FUNDS	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL
61	2,387,062	2.4	40	1,020,450	9.0	101	\$ 3,407,512	3.1			
84	23,048,514	23.6	51	3,122,668	27.5	135	26,171,182	24.0			
175	68,215,528	70.0	54	6,638,391	58.4	229	74,853,919	68.8			
21	3,821,930	3.9	13	582,410	5.1	34	4,404,340	4.0			
	<u>\$97,473,034</u>	<u>100.0</u>		<u>\$11,363,919</u>	<u>100.0</u>		<u>\$108,836,953</u>	<u>100.0</u>			
38	\$ 14,869,603	10.1	15	\$ 873,491	6.3	53	\$ 15,743,094	9.8			
47	19,385,436	13.2	19	1,201,841	8.6	65	20,587,277	12.8			
54	19,405,145	13.2	30	1,877,677	13.5	84	21,282,822	13.2			
103	30,608,029	20.8	39	2,670,721	19.2	142	33,278,750	20.7			
145	57,904,075	39.4	53	6,258,880	45.0	198	64,162,955	39.9			
18	2,342,555	1.6	8	470,645	3.4	26	2,813,200	1.8			
42	<u>2,334,441</u>	<u>1.6</u>	24	<u>549,510</u>	<u>4.0</u>	66	<u>2,883,951</u>	<u>1.8</u>			
	<u>\$146,849,284</u>	<u>100.0</u>		<u>\$13,902,765</u>	<u>100.0</u>		<u>\$160,752,049</u>	<u>100.0</u>			

45. For each source of funding or services, what reporting requirements are required? (Next to each statement place the source numbers which apply. If all sources fall in one category, enter "ALL" in the box.)

Sources (Insert numbers)	
(1) No report	
(2) Annual or grant anniversary report	
(3) Reporting more frequently than once a year	
(4) Other (Please specify)	
TOTAL	

46. For each source of funding or services which requires a report, what data are required? (Next to each statement place the source numbers which apply. If all sources fall in one category, enter "ALL" in the box.)

Sources (Insert numbers)	
(1) Data on type of clients	
(2) Data on type of cases	
(3) Data on number of cases	
(4) Financial data	
(5) All of the above	
(6) Other (Please specify)	
(7) Nothing is specified	
TOTAL	

APPENDIX II

	LSC PROVIDERS			NON-LSC PROVIDERS			ALL PROVIDERS		
	NUMBER 1/ RESPONDING	NUMBER 2/ PERCENTAGE		NUMBER 1/ RESPONDING	NUMBER 2/ PERCENTAGE		NUMBER 1/ RESPONDING	NUMBER 2/ PERCENTAGE	
47. To what extent does the local bar association encourage financial support of your project by local government and private law firms? (Check one.)	225			129			354		
1- Very large extent	9	4.0		21	16.3		30	8.5	
2- Substantial extent	15	6.7		9	7.0		24	6.8	
3- Moderate extent	21	9.3		12	9.3		33	9.3	
4- Some extent	36	16.0		18	14.0		54	15.3	
5- Little or no extent	144	64.0		69	53.5		213	60.2	

48. Do you know of any other resources for civil legal services for the poor in the geographic area that your project serves? (Check one.)

1- Yes (Please specify and GO TO QUESTION 49)	225		133	358					
2- No (GO TO QUESTION 50)	81	36.0	66	49.6		147	41.1		
	144	64.0	67	50.4		211	58.9		

APPENDIX II

	LSC PROVIDERS		NON-LSC PROVIDERS		ALL PROVIDERS	
	NUMBER 1/ RESPONDING	RESPONSES 2/ PERCENTAGE	NUMBER 1/ RESPONDING	RESPONSES 2/ PERCENTAGE	NUMBER 1/ RESPONDING	RESPONSES 2/ PERCENTAGE
49. What is the relationship between the other resource(s) and your project? (Check those which apply.)	80		65		145	
1- <input type="checkbox"/> No relationship	14	17.5	11	16.9	25	17.2
2- <input type="checkbox"/> We share physical resources	6	7.5	5	7.7	11	7.6
3- <input type="checkbox"/> We make referrals to one another	60	75.0	48	73.8	108	74.5
4- <input type="checkbox"/> We advise each other	24	30.0	18	27.7	42	29.0
5- <input type="checkbox"/> We supply staff to one another	6	7.5	3	4.6	9	6.2
6- <input type="checkbox"/> Overlap in board of directors/or staff of one on board of other	20	25.0	9	13.8	29	20.0
7- <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Please specify) _____	10	12.5	12	18.5	22	15.2
50. To what extent do you make an effort to solicit free legal service from attorneys or law firms in the area? (Check one.)	226		132		358	
1- <input type="checkbox"/> Little or no extent	33	14.6	42	31.8	75	20.9
2- <input type="checkbox"/> Some extent	77	34.1	34	25.8	111	31.0
3- <input type="checkbox"/> Moderate extent	63	27.9	18	13.6	81	22.6
4- <input type="checkbox"/> Substantial extent	38	16.8	9	6.8	47	13.1
5- <input type="checkbox"/> Very large extent	15	6.6	29	22.0	44	12.3

	LSC PROVIDERS			NON-LSC PROVIDERS			ALL PROVIDERS		
	NUMBER 1/ RESPONDING	RESPONSES 2/ PERCENTAGE		NUMBER 1/ RESPONDING	RESPONSES 2/ PERCENTAGE		NUMBER 1/ RESPONDING	RESPONSES 2/ PERCENTAGE	
51. To what extent have attorneys and law firms responded by providing free legal services? (Check one.)	225			131			356		
1- Little or no extent	72	32.0		45	34.4		117	32.9	
2- Some extent	84	37.3		32	24.4		116	32.6	
3- Moderate extent	44	19.6		21	16.0		65	18.3	
4- Substantial extent	18	8.0		11	8.4		29	8.1	
5- Very large extent	7	3.1		22	16.8		29	8.1	
52. Do you maintain a list of private attorneys willing to give free legal services? (Check one.)	224			133			357		
1- Yes	128	57.1		63	47.4		191	53.5	
2- No. Why not? _____	96	42.9		70	52.6		166	46.5	
53. To what extent does the local bar association encourage attorneys to provide free legal services? (Check one.)	221			125			346		
1- Little or no extent	115	52.0		50	40.0		165	47.7	
2- Some extent	48	21.7		33	26.4		81	23.4	
3- Moderate extent	35	15.8		17	13.6		52	15.0	
4- Substantial extent	16	7.2		9	7.2		25	7.2	
5- Very large extent	7	3.2		16	12.8		22	6.6	

LSC PROVIDERS			NON-LSC PROVIDERS			ALL PROVIDERS		
NUMBER 1/ RESPONDING	RESPONSES 2/ NUMBER	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER 1/ RESPONDING	RESPONSES 2/ NUMBER	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER 1/ RESPONDING	RESPONSES 2/ NUMBER	PERCENTAGE

54. Considering all the free legal services that you could receive, what is the extent of the services provided? (Check one.)

- 1- ☐ No free legal services at all
- 2- ☐ Advice only (no litigation)—in all areas of civil law with no exceptions
- 3- ☐ Advice only (no litigation)—with exceptions (Check exceptions below.)
- 4- ☐ Complete range of civil legal services
- 5- ☐ Rather complete range of civil legal services including litigation with exceptions (Check exceptions below.)

Exceptions:

- 61- ☐ Housing
- 62- ☐ Consumer problems
- 63- ☐ Family or domestic affairs
- 64- ☐ Administrative/Government benefits
- 65- ☐ Employment discrimination
- 66- ☐ Other (Please specify) _____

Data obtained was insufficient for analysis

	LSC PROVIDERS			NON-LSC PROVIDERS			ALL PROVIDERS		
	NUMBER RESPONDING	NUMBER SPECIAL EFFORT	PERCENTAGE INDICATING SPECIAL EFFORT	NUMBER RESPONDING	NUMBER SPECIAL EFFORT	PERCENTAGE INDICATING SPECIAL EFFORT	NUMBER RESPONDING	NUMBER SPECIAL EFFORT	PERCENTAGE INDICATING SPECIAL EFFORT
VI. COMMUNITY									
55. Listed below are a number of groups.									
(1) Indicate whether special efforts are made to serve each group.									
(2) Indicate approximately how many cases have been handled by your project during your last fiscal or recording year.									
	216			106			322		
(1) Welfare recipients	125		57.9	45		42.5	170		52.8
(2) Elderly	139		64.4	48		45.3	187		58.1
(3) Juveniles	47		21.8	17		16.0	64		19.9
(4) Prisoners	33		15.3	13		12.3	46		14.3
(5) American Indians	21		9.7	8		7.5	29		9.0
(6) Mentally hospitalized	48		22.2	11		10.4	59		18.3
(7) Hospitalized in general	19		8.8	12		11.3	31		9.6
(8) Disabled	67		31.0	32		30.2	99		30.7
(9) Unemployed	69		31.9	27		25.5	96		9.8
(10) Migrants	34		15.7	8		7.5	42		13.0
(11) Immigrants	21		9.7	10		9.4	31		9.6

*Data obtained was insufficient for analysis

LSC PROVIDERS			NON-LSC PROVIDERS			ALL PROVIDERS		
NUMBER 1/ RESPONDING	RESPONSES 2/ PERCENTAGE		NUMBER 1/ RESPONDING	RESPONSES 2/ PERCENTAGE		NUMBER 1/ RESPONDING	RESPONSES 2/ PERCENTAGE	
VII. ORGANIZATIONAL SUGGESTIONS								
56. Consider the concept of a legal services office in the community which would be staffed to handle both criminal and civil legal needs at the same location. To what extent would this concept be useful to clients as far as dispensing services is concerned? (Check one.)								
218			127			345		
1- Very large extent	59	27.1	27	21.3		86	24.9	
2- Substantial extent	57	26.1	22	17.3		79	22.9	
3- Moderate extent	33	15.1	22	17.3		55	15.9	
4- Some extent	33	15.1	25	19.7		58	16.8	
5- Little or no extent	36	16.5	31	24.4		67	19.4	
57. To what extent do you think a combined criminal/civil office could be cost effective? (Check one.)								
214			122			336		
1- Very large extent	52	24.3	26	21.3		78	23.2	
2- Substantial extent	44	20.6	17	13.9		61	18.2	
3- Moderate extent	39	18.2	20	16.4		59	17.6	
4- Some extent	38	17.8	29	23.3		67	19.9	
5- Little or no extent	41	19.2	30	24.6		71	21.1	

	LSC PROVIDERS		NON-LSC PROVIDERS		ALL PROVIDERS	
	NUMBER 1/ RESPONDING	RESPONSES 2/ PERCENTAGE	NUMBER 1/ RESPONDING	RESPONSES 2/ PERCENTAGE	NUMBER 1/ RESPONDING	RESPONSES 2/ PERCENTAGE
58. Should the same eligibility criteria with respect to income standards of clients be established for all civil legal service projects for the poor? (Check one.)	220		127		347	
1- <input type="checkbox"/> Definitely not	73	33.2	26	20.5	99	28.5
2- <input type="checkbox"/> Probably not	70	31.8	38	29.9	108	31.1
3- <input type="checkbox"/> Maybe	13	5.9	10	7.9	23	6.6
4- <input type="checkbox"/> Probably yes	37	16.8	28	22.0	65	18.7
5- <input type="checkbox"/> Definitely yes	9	4.1	15	11.8	24	6.9
6- <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know	18	8.2	10	7.9	28	8.1

59. How would you rate each of these systems on the overall cost of providing legal services? (Check one box per system.)

SYSTEM	TYPE OF PROVIDER	NUMBER RESPONDING	PERCENTAGE RESPONDING					DON'T KNOW
			VERY EXPENSIVE	SOMEWHAT EXPENSIVE	NEITHER EXPENSIVE NOR INEXPENSIVE	SOMEWHAT INEXPENSIVE	VERY INEXPENSIVE	
PREPAID	LSC	215	18.1	28.4	14.9	8.8	0	29.8
	NON-LSC	113	7.1	21.2	12.4	15.0	2.7	41.6
VOUCHER	LSC	214	31.3	29.0	4.7	3.3	1.9	29.9
	NON-LSC	113	13.3	26.5	15.0	7.1	1.8	36.3
JUDICARE	LSC	214	48.6	23.8	5.6	1.9	.9	19.2
	NON-LSC	113	30.1	25.7	10.6	6.2	2.7	24.8
STAFF	LSC	216	.5	3.2	22.7	31.9	35.2	6.5
	NON-LSC	114	1.3	7.9	21.9	28.1	18.4	16.4

60. How would you rate each of these systems on the number of poor people each could reach? (Check one box per system.)

PERCENTAGE RESPONDING								
SYSTEM	TYPE OF PROVIDER	NUMBER RESPONDING	VERY SMALL	SOMEWHAT SMALL	NEITHER SMALL NOR LARGE	SOMEWHAT LARGE	VERY LARGE	DON'T KNOW
PREPAID	LSC	213	27.2	21.6	13.6	12.2	2.8	22.5
	NON-LSC	117	20.5	14.5	14.5	15.4	6.0	29.1
VOUCHER	LSC	213	16 0	24.4	20.7	9.9	4.7	24.4
	NON-LSC	117	9.4	16.2	16.2	17.1	7.7	33.3
JUDICARE	LSC	213	18.3	20.2	16.4	15.0	8.5	21.6
	NON-LSC	117	12.0	5.1	16.2	21.4	21.4	23.9
STAFF	LSC	213	.5	.9	2.3	27.2	62.9	6.1
	NON-LSC	117	.9	4.3	9.4	26.5	43.6	15.4

APPENDIX II

APPENDIX II

61. How would you rate each of these systems on how well the clients would like the format of the system? (Check one box per system.)

PERCENTAGE RESPONDING								
SYSTEM	TYPE OF PROVIDER	NUMBER RESPONDING	EXTREMELY DISLIKE	SOME DISLIKE	NEITHER LIKE NOR DISLIKE		EXTREMELY LIKE	DON'T KNOW
					DISLIKE	DISLIKE		
PREPAID	LSC	212	9.4	14.6	16.5	21.2	6.6	31.6
	NON-LSC	116	8.5	12.9	16.4	19.8	10.3	31.9
VOUCHER	LSC	212	11.8	21.7	12.7	17.0	6.1	30.7
	NON-LSC	116	6.0	17.2	13.8	21.6	7.8	33.6
JULICARE	LSC	211	5.7	19.0	16.6	23.7	8.5	26.5
	NON-LSC	116	2.6	7.8	10.3	27.6	25.0	26.7
STAFF	LSC	213	0	2.8	10.3	45.5	32.9	8.5
	NON-LSC	117	.9	12.0	14.5	33.3	17.9	21.4

62. How would you rate each of these systems on how well the objectives of providing legal services to the poor would be met? (check one box per system)

SYSTEM	TYPE OF PROVIDER	NUMBER RESPONDING	PERCENTAGE RESPONDING					DON'T KNOW
			VERY POOR	SOMEWHAT POOR	NEITHER WELL NOR POOR	SOMEWHAT WELL	VERY WELL	
PREPAID	LSC	212	25.0	19.8	17.9	13.2	1.4	22.6
	NON-LSC	115	16.5	14.8	12.2	19.1	7.8	29.6
VOUCHER	LSC	211	29.4	26.5	14.7	8.1	.9	20.4
	NON-LSC	117	14.5	21.4	16.2	15.4	5.1	27.4
JUDICARE	LSC	211	26.1	26.5	15.6	13.7	1.9	16.1
	NON-LSC	117	15.4	12.0	12.0	22.2	18.8	19.7
STAFF	LSC	213	0	.9	1.4	22.5	70.4	4.7
	NON-LSC	117	0	6.8	7.7	38.5	33.3	13.7

	LSC PROVIDERS			NON-LSC PROVIDERS			ALL PROVIDERS		
	NUMBER RESPONDING	1/ NUMBER	2/ PERCENTAGE	NUMBER RESPONDING	1/ NUMBER	2/ PERCENTAGE	NUMBER RESPONDING	1/ NUMBER	2/ PERCENTAGE
63. How useful would it be to institute a sliding scale fee which would allow your project to serve clients above the poverty guidelines with the income generated being used to serve more clients who are poor? (Check one.)	220			123			343		
1- Very useless	55		25.0	23		18.7	78		22.7
2- Somewhat useless	30		13.6	14		11.4	44		12.8
3- Neither useful nor useless	9		4.1	9		7.3	18		5.2
4- Somewhat useful	63		28.6	29		23.6	92		26.8
5- Very useful	40		18.2	35		28.5	75		21.9
6- Don't know	23		10.5	13		10.6	36		10.5
OTHER COMMENTS:									

63. How useful would it be to institute a sliding scale fee which would allow your project to serve clients above the poverty guidelines with the income generated being used to serve more clients who are poor? (Check one.)

- 1- Very useless
 2- Somewhat useless
 3- Neither useful nor useless
 4- Somewhat useful
 5- Very useful
 6- Don't know

OTHER COMMENTS:

LSC PROVIDERS			NON-LSC PROVIDERS			ALL PROVIDERS		
NUMBER 1/ RESPONDING	RESPONSES 2/ PERCENTAGE		NUMBER 1/ RESPONDING	RESPONSES 2/ PERCENTAGE		NUMBER 1/ RESPONDING	RESPONSES 2/ PERCENTAGE	
222			121			343		
1- — Very useless	50	22.5	22	18.2		72	21.0	
2- — Somewhat useless	36	16.2	12	9.9		48	14.0	
3- — Neither useful nor useless	14	6.3	10	8.3		24	7.0	
4- — Somewhat useful	44	19.8	27	22.3		71	20.7	
5- — Very useful	47	21.2	27	22.3		74	21.6	
6- — Don't know	31	14.0	23	19.0		54	15.7	

64. How useful would it be to have a centralized, statewide office the purpose of which would be to seek and disperse all funds from various funding agencies? (Check one.)

- 1- — Very useless
 2- — Somewhat useless
 3- — Neither useful nor useless
 4- — Somewhat useful
 5- — Very useful
 6- — Don't know

65. If there are any other comments you wish to make about civil legal services for the poor, do so here. Attach additional sheets if necessary.

1/ Number of projects responding to the question.

2/ Number and percentage of projects that checked this response. Percents may not add to total due to rounding.

3/ Because sufficient information was not available in most instances to meaningfully distinguish between the civil and criminal legal services activities of these projects, the responses of such providers are not included in this appendix and are not considered in most discussions in our report.

4/ Several projects listed job titles not found in question 8-2, e.g. accountant, auditor, intake specialist. These job titles were tabulated under "other."

5/ Many projects checked more than one response, therefore the answers were tabulated as a "check those which apply" question.

6/ Range was from 5% to 75%.

7/ The types of cases most frequently listed were: torts, juvenile, probate, education and mental health.

8/ Of the projects, 63 (28.0 percent) identified only "first come, first served" as the criteria.

9/ Projection to include non-respondents yields a total estimate of \$2.2 million.

10/ Percentage for non-Corporation resources only was 79.2%.

11/ Percentage for non-Corporation resources only was 71.1%.

12/ Percentage for non-Corporation resources only was 13.1%.

13/ Percentages for non-Corporation resources were (1) 13.7%, (2) 20.4%, (3) 6.8%, (4) 32.3%, and (5) 26.7%.

RESULTS OF GAO'S POTENTIAL CLIENT INTERVIEWS 1/I BACKGROUND

1. _____
 (NAME OF INTERVIEWEE) /OPTIONAL/

2. _____
 (CITY/TOWN) (ZIP CODE)

3. SEX:			<u>PERCENT</u>
(Check one)	1- 442	Male	35.1
	2- 817	Female	64.9
	1259	Subtotal	100.0
	1	Not Recorded	
	<u>1260</u>	Total	

4. RACE:			<u>PERCENT RECORDED</u>
(Check one)	1- 394	Black	31.4
	2- 674	White	53.7
	3- 7	Indian	.6
	4- 31	Oriental	2.5
	5- 149	Other (Please specify) _____	<u>11.9</u>
			100.0
	<u>1255</u>	Subtotal	
	<u>5</u>	Not Recorded	
	<u>1260</u>	Total	

5. What is your native language? (Check one)			<u>PERCENT RECORDED</u>
	1- 1104	English	87.9
	2- 95	Spanish	7.6
	3- 1	Chinese	.1
	4- 56	Other (Please specify) _____	<u>4.5</u>
	1256	Subtotal	100.0
	4	Not Recorded	
	<u>1260</u>	Total	

6. How long have you lived at your current address?

_____ years _____ months

IF TWO YEARS OR MORE, GO TO Q 9

		<u>PERCENT RESPONDING</u>
Response: Less than 2 years	439	35.1
2 years or more	812	64.9
Subtotal	<u>1251</u>	<u>100.0</u>
No Response	9	
Total	<u>1260</u>	

7. How long have you lived in this community? (Community may have to be defined as a portion of the city, this town, this part of the county, etc.)

_____ years _____ months

IF TWO YEARS OR MORE, GO TO Q 9

		<u>PERCENT RESPONDING</u>
Response: Less than 2 years	95	66.4
2 years or more	48	33.6
Subtotal	<u>143</u>	<u>100.0</u>
No Response	1117	
Total	<u>1260</u>	

8. How long have you lived in _____?
(City/County)

_____ years _____ months

IF LESS THAN ONE YEAR, THANK RESPONDENT FOR HELP AND TERMINATE INTERVIEW.

Response: Less than 1 year	_____
1 year or more	<u>141</u>
No Response	<u>1119</u>
Total	<u>1260</u>

9. In what community did you live before?

10. Are you a full-time student? (Check one)

		<u>PERCENT RESPONDING</u>
1- <u>30</u>	Yes	2.4
2- <u>1229</u>	No (GO TO Q 12)	<u>97.6</u>
<u>1259</u>	Subtotal	100.0
<u>1</u>	No Response	
<u>1260</u>	Total	

11. Have you lived in _____ for 5 years or more? (Check one)
(City/County)

1- <u>23</u>	Yes
2- _____	No (THANK RESPONDENT FOR HELP AND TERMINATE INTERVIEW)
<u>1237</u>	No Response
<u>1260</u>	Total

Now, I'd like to ask you a few questions about the members of your household (whether or not related to you).

12. How many people live with you?

_____ people + respondent = _____
2846 + 1260 = 4,106

13. Would you describe yourself as: (Check one)

		<u>PERCENT RESPONDING</u>
1- <u>261</u>	Single	20.7
2- <u>447</u>	Married	35.5
3- <u>178</u>	Separated	14.1
4- <u>181</u>	Divorced	14.4
5- <u>191</u>	Widowed	<u>15.2</u>
<u>1258</u>	Subtotal	100.0
<u>2</u>	No Response	
<u>1260</u>	Total	

14. What are the sources of income in the household? (Check one)

- 1- 72 Unemployment compensation
- 2- 376 Public assistance money
- 3- 415 Wages from job
- 4- 13 Financial aid from relatives or friends
(not in the household)
- 6- 140 Supplemental Security Income
- 7- 42 Pension
- 8- 1 Workman's Compensation
- 9- 320 SSA
- 5- 192 Other (Please Specify) _____

- 8 No Response

15. Consider the total gross income of your household (before taxes) for the year 1975. Between which two letters does the income fit?

FOR ALL INCOME SCHEDULES

Show the appropriate income schedule	Family Size	Area Income Level <u>a/</u> Ceiling (Ranges)	Respondents w/Income By Level	Percent Responding
I Non-farm - all states except Alaska and Hawaii	1	\$ 2400- 3240	67	5.3
II Farm - all states except Alaska and Hawaii	2	3160- 4270	637	50.6
III Non-farm - Hawaii	3	3920- 5300	238	18.9
IV Farm - Hawaii	4	4680- 6330	147	11.7
Respondent can indicate the yearly, monthly or weekly income figure. If only semi-monthly is known, compute by halving the monthly. If only bi- weekly is known, compute by doubling the weekly.	5	5440- 7360	91	7.2
	6	6200- 8390	48	3.8
	7	6960- 9420	13	1.0
	8	7720-10450	10	.8
	9	8480-11480	5	.4
	10	9240-12510	1	.1
	11	10000-13540	1	.1
	12	10760-14570	1	.1
	Subtotal		1260	100.0
	No Response		1	
	Total		1260	

a/Income ranges are maximum allowable incomes,
by family size, at the time of interview. The
lowest allowable is from income schedule II and
the highest allowable is from income schedule III.

17. Do you pay rent for your apartment or house? (Check one)

		<u>PERCENT RESPONDING</u>
1- <u>908</u>	Yes	<u>72.1</u>
2- <u>351</u>	No	<u>27.9</u>
<u>1259</u>	Subtotal	100.0
<u>1</u>	No Response	
<u>1260</u>	Total	

18. Do you live in public housing? (Check one)

		<u>PERCENT RESPONDING</u>
1- <u>195</u>	Yes	<u>15.6</u>
2- <u>1058</u>	No	<u>84.4</u>
<u>1253</u>	Subtotal	100.0
<u>7</u>	No Response	
<u>1260</u>	Total	

19. What was the highest level of education you completed?

_____ years H.S. grad = 12
 College grad. = 16
 Beyond college add years

<u>Years Completed</u>	<u>Responses</u>	<u>PERCENT RESPONDING</u>
Less than 1	21	1.7
Between 1 and 8	400	32.0
Between 9 and 12	631	50.5
Between 13 and 16	182	14.6
17 to as much as 20	<u>15</u>	<u>1.3</u>
Subtotal	1249	100.0
No Response	<u>11</u>	
Total	<u>1260</u>	

II LEGAL ACTION AGAINST SOMEONE

20. Have you or anyone in your household taken legal action against someone in the last year?

		<u>PERCENT</u>
1-	126 Yes	10.0
2-	1134 No (GO TO Q 31)	90.0
	<u>1260</u> Total	<u>100.0</u>

21. How many such cases have there been in the last year?

_____ cases.

<u>Number of Cases Reported</u>	<u>Responses</u>	<u>PERCENT RESPONDING</u>
1	113	92.6
2	8	6.6
4	<u>1</u>	<u>.8</u>
Subtotal	122	100.0
No Response	<u>4</u>	
Total	<u>126</u>	

WHEN MORE THAN ONE CASE, RECORD ONLY MOST RECENT

22. What type of problem was the most recent problem? (Check one)

		<u>PERCENT RESPONDING</u>
1-	13 Housing	10.4
2-	10 Consumer problem	8.0
3-	55 Family or domestic affairs	44.0
4-	9 Administrative/Government benefits (welfare, food stamps, etc.)	7.2
5-	12 Employment and discrimination	9.6
6-	26 Other (Please specify) _____	20.8
	<u>125</u> Subtotal	<u>100.0</u>
	<u>1</u> No Response	
	<u>126</u> Total	

23. Who from your household was involved? (Check those which apply)

		<u>As a Percent of 126</u>
1-	<u>109</u> Self	86.5
2-	<u>20</u> Spouse	22.2
3-	<u>12</u> Child	9.5
4-	<u>5</u> Other relative (please specify)	4.0
5-	<u>3</u> Non relative (Please specify)	2.4

24. Please explain the case:

25. What was the outcome of the case? (interpret answer and check one)

		<u>PERCENT RESPONDING</u>
1-	<u>54</u> Still going on - unresolved	43.2
2-	<u>44</u> Household member's objective substantially obtained	35.2
3-	<u>14</u> Household member's objective somewhat obtained	11.2
4-	<u>10</u> Household member's objective not obtained	8.0
5-	<u>3</u> Other (Please specify) _____	2.4
	<u>125</u> Subtotal	100.0
	<u>1</u> No Response	
	<u>126</u> Total	

26. Did you or anyone in your household have legal help with this case?
(Check one)

		<u>PERCENT RESPONDING</u>
1-	<u>102</u> Yes	81.0
2-	<u>24</u> No (GO TO Q 29)	19.0
	<u>126</u> Total	100.0

27. What type of lawyer was used? (Check one)		<u>PERCENT RESPONDING</u>
1- <u>67</u>	Private	56.3
2- <u>23</u>	Legal aid	22.8
3- <u>2</u>	Neighborhood legal services	2.0
4- _____	Law school clinic - provide list to select from (which one? _____)	
5- <u>2</u>	Public interest (Check one)	2.0
	51- _____ ACLU	
	52- _____ NAACP	
	53- _____ Urban League	
	54- <u>2</u> Other (Please specify) _____	
6- <u>7</u>	Other (Please specify) _____	
		<u>6.9</u>
<u>101</u>	Subtotal	100.0
<u>1</u>	No Response	
<u>102</u>	Total	

28. How was this lawyer found? (Check one box per item)

Did you:	1-Yes	2-No	Subtotal	No Response	Total
(1) See lawyer before	9	88	97	5	102
(2) Know lawyer personally	8	88	96	6	102
(3) Get lawyer's name from friend/relative	67	30	97	5	102
(4) Find lawyer in phone book	2	93	95	7	102
(5) Get lawyer's name from welfare, food stamp, etc. agency	9	86	95	7	102
(6) See advertising about lawyer or legal service	2	93	95	7	102
(7) Other (Please specify)	18	56	74	28	102

(GO TO Q 31)

THOSE WHO FOUND A LAWYER

<u>Code</u>	<u>Yes Response</u>	<u>As a Percent of 102</u>
1	9	8.8
2	8	7.8
3	67	65.7
4	2	2.0
5	9	8.8
6	2	2.0
7	18	17.6

2). Why wasn't a lawyer used? (Check one box per item)

Did you:	1-Yes	2-No	Subtotal	No Response	Total
(1) Feel you could handle the problem yourself	12	12	24		24
(2) Think it would be too expensive	15	9	24		24
(3) Go to a lawyer who then didn't take your case	4	20	24		24
(4) Not know how to get a lawyer	2	22	24		24
(5) Feel that lawyers could not be trusted	2	22	24		24
(6) Find you didn't have transportation to go to lawyer	1	23	24		24
(7) Have other kinds of assistance		24	24		24
(8) Other (Please specify)	4	13	17	7	24

Code	Those Answering Yes	as	A Percent of 24
1	12		50.0
2	15		62.5
3	4		16.7
4	2		8.3
5	2		8.3
6	1		4.2
7			
8	4		16.7

30. Looking back, do you think it would have been better to consult with a lawyer? (Check all that apply)

		As a Percent of 24
1- <u>12</u>	No	<u>50.0</u>
2- <u>12</u>	Yes	50.0
21- <u>6</u>	Probably could have had a better outcome	
22- <u>5</u>	Could have used some advice	
23- <u>0</u>	Got misled by others	
24- <u>1</u>	Did not know procedures	
25- <u>1</u>	Other (Please specify) _____	
<u>24</u>	Total	<u>100.0</u>

III LEGAL ACTION AGAINST YOU

31. Has anyone taken legal action against you or any member of your household in the last year? (Check one)

		PERCENT
1- <u>95</u>	Yes	7.5
2- <u>1165</u>	No (GO TO Q 42)	<u>92.5</u>
<u>1260</u>	Total	<u>100.0</u>

32. How many such cases have there been in the last year?

_____ cases

<u>No. of Cases Reported</u>	<u>Responses</u>	<u>PERCENT RESPONDING</u>
1	75	79.8
2	11	11.7
3	4	4.3
4	1	1.1
5	1	1.1
6	1	1.1
8	<u>1</u>	<u>1.1</u>
Subtotal	94	100.0
No Response	<u>1</u>	
Total	<u>95</u>	

WHEN MORE THAN ONE CASE, RECORD ONLY MOST RECENT

33. What type of problem was the most recent problem? (Check one)

	<u>PERCENT RESPONDING</u>
1- <u>9</u> Housing	9.6
2- <u>25</u> Consumer problem	26.6
3- <u>20</u> Family or domestic affairs	21.3
4- <u>5</u> Administrative/Government benefits (welfare, food stamp, etc.)	5.3
5- <u>1</u> Employment and discrimination	1.1
6- <u>34</u> Other (Please specify) _____	<u>36.2</u>
<u>94</u> Subtotal	100.0
<u>1</u> No Response	
<u>95</u> Total	

34. Who from your household was involved? (Check those which apply)

		<u>As a Percent of 95</u>
1- <u>75</u>	Self	78.9
2- <u>24</u>	Spouse	25.3
3- <u>14</u>	Child	14.7
4- <u>7</u>	Other relative (Please specify)	7.4
5- <u>3</u>	Non relative (Please specify)	3.2

35. Please explain the case:

36. What was the outcome of the case? (interpret answer and check one)

		<u>PERCENT RESPONDING</u>
1- <u>33</u>	Still going on - unresolved	35.1
2- <u>18</u>	Household member's objective substantially obtained	19.1
3- <u>3</u>	Household member's objective somewhat obtained	3.2
4- <u>25</u>	Household member's objective not obtained	26.6
5- <u>15</u>	Other (Please specify) _____	<u>16.0</u>
<u>94</u>	Subtotal	100.0
<u>1</u>	No Response	
<u>95</u>	Total	

37. Did you or anyone in your household have legal help with this case? (Check one)

		<u>PERCENT RESPONDING</u>
1- <u>44</u>	Yes	<u>46.8</u>
2- <u>50</u>	No (GO TO Q 40)	<u>53.2</u>
<u>94</u>	Total	100.0

38. What type of lawyer was used? (Check one)

		<u>PERCENT RESPONDING</u>
1- <u>20</u>	Private	45.5
2- <u>10</u>	Legal aid	22.7
3- <u>4</u>	Neighborhood legal services	9.1
4- _____	Law school clinic - provide list to select from (which one? _____)	
5- <u>1</u>	Public interest (Check one)	2.3
51- _____	ACLU	
52- _____	NALCP	
53- _____	Urban League	
54- <u>1</u>	Other (Please specify) _____	
6- <u>9</u>	Other (Please specify) _____	<u>20.5</u>
<u>44</u>	Total	100.0

39. How was this lawyer found? (Check one box per item)

Did you:	1-Yes	2-No	Subtotal	No Response	Total
(1) See lawyer before	4	34	38	6	44
(2) Know lawyer personally	2	36	38	6	44
(3) Get lawyer's name from friend/relative	17	21	38	6	44
(4) Find lawyer in phone book	3	35	38	6	44
(5) Get lawyer's name from welfare, food stamp, etc. agency	3	35	38	6	44
(6) See advertising about lawyer or legal service	1	37	38	6	44
(7) Other (Please specify) _____	17	20	37	7	44

(GO TO Q 42)

THOSE WHO FOUND A LAWYER

Code	Yes Response	As a Percent of 44
1	4	9.1
2	2	4.5
3	17	38.6
4	3	6.8
5	3	6.8
6	1	2.3
7	17	38.6

40. Why wasn't a lawyer used? (Check one box per item)

Did you:	1-Yes	2-No	Subtotal	No Response	Total
(1) Feel you could handle the problem yourself	18	28	46	4	50
(2) Think it would be too expensive	28	16	44	6	50
(3) Go to a lawyer who then didn't take your case	3	39	42	8	50
(4) Not know how to get a lawyer	4	38	42	8	50
(5) Feel that lawyers could not be trusted	6	36	42	8	50
(6) Find you didn't have transportation to get a lawyer	2	40	42	8	50
(7) Have other kinds of assistance	2	39	41	9	50
(8) Other (Please specify) _____	11	21	32	18	50

Those Answering		as	A Percent of 50
Code	Yes		
1	18		36.0
2	28		56.0
3	3		6.0
4	4		8.0
5	6		12.0
6	2		4.0
7	2		4.0
8	11		22.0

41. Looking back, do you think it would have been better to consult with a lawyer? (Check all that apply)			<u>PERCENT RESPONDING</u>
1-	<u>31</u>	No	64.6
2-	<u>17</u>	Yes	35.4
21-	<u>17</u>	Probably could have had a better outcome	
22-	<u>12</u>	Could have used some advice	
23-	<u>3</u>	Got misled by others	
24-	<u>4</u>	Did not know procedures	
25-	<u>4</u>	Other (Please specify) _____	
<u>48</u>	Subtotal		<u>100.0</u>
<u>2</u>	No Response		
<u>50</u>	Total		

IV DECISION NOT TO APPEAR IN COURT

42. Have you or anyone in your household received notice to go to court (for anything other than parking violations) in the last year, but decided not to go? (Check one)			<u>PERCENT RESPONDING</u>
1-	<u>35</u>	Yes	2.8
2-	<u>1222</u>	No (GO TO Q 49)	97.2
	<u>1257</u>	Subtotal	100.0
	<u>3</u>	No Response	
	<u>1260</u>	Total	

43. How many such cases have there been in the last year?

_____ cases

<u>No. of Cases Reported</u>	<u>Responses</u>	<u>PERCENT RESPONDING</u>
1	32	97.0
2	1	3.0
Subtotal	33	100.0
No Response	2	
Total	<u>35</u>	

WHEN MORE THAN ONE CASE, RECORD ONLY MOST RECENT

44. What type of problem was the most recent problem? (Check one)

		<u>PERCENT RESPONDING</u>
1- <u>4</u>	Housing	11.4
2- <u>5</u>	Consumer problem	14.3
3- <u>2</u>	Family or domestic affairs	5.7
4- <u>—</u>	Administrative/Government benefits (welfare, food stamps, etc.)	
5- <u>1</u>	Employment and discrimination	2.9
6- <u>23</u>	Other (Please specify) <u> </u>	<u>65.7</u>
<u>35</u>	Subtotal	100.0
<u> </u>	No Response	
<u>35</u>	Total	

45. Who from your household was involved? (Check those which apply)

		<u>As a Percent of 35</u>
1- <u>28</u>	Self	80.0
2- <u>4</u>	Spouse	11.4
3- <u>2</u>	Child	5.7
4- <u>4</u>	Other relative (Please specify) <u> </u>	11.4
5- <u> </u>	Non relative (Please specify) <u> </u>	

46. Please explain the case:

47. What was the outcome of the case? (interpret answer and check on)

		<u>PERCENT RESPONDING</u>
1- <u>7</u>	Still going on - unresolved	20.6
2- <u>3</u>	Household member's objective substantially obtained	8.8
3- <u>2</u>	Household member's objective somewhat obtained	5.9
4- <u>13</u>	Household member's objective not obtained	38.2
5- <u>9</u>	Other (Please specify) _____	<u>26.5</u>
<hr/>		
<u>34</u>	Subtotal	100.0
<u>1</u>	No Response	
<u>35</u>	Total	

48. Why didn't you or the member of your household go to court? (Check one box per item)

	1-Yes	2-No	Subtotal	No Response	Total
(1) Lawyer went instead	1	24	25	10	35
(2) Didn't understand what to do	8	17	25	10	35
(3) Problem was solved outside of court	4	22	26	9	35
(4) Afraid to go	5	19	25	10	35
(5) Other (Please specify) _____	19	11	30	5	35

DID NOT GO TO COURT BECAUSE:

<u>Code</u>	<u>Yes Response</u>	<u>As a Percent of 35</u>
1	1	2.9
2	8	22.9
3	4	11.4
4	6	17.1
5	19	54.3

V NEED FOR LAWYER'S HELP

49. In the last year, have you or anyone in your household had any kind of problems which you thought needed a lawyer's help? (Check one)

EXCLUDE COURT APPEARANCES OR SUMMONSES
MENTIONED PREVIOUSLY-

PERCENT RESPONDING

1- <u>323</u>	Yes	25.7
2- <u>935</u>	No (GO TO Q 61)	<u>74.3</u>
<u>1258</u>	Subtotal	100.0
<u>2</u>	No Response	
<u>1260</u>	Total	

50. How many such cases have there been in the last year?

_____ cases

<u>No. of Cases Reported</u>	<u>Responses</u>	<u>PERCENT RESPONDING</u>
1	260	83.6
2	35	11.3
3	5	1.6
4	3	1.0
5	2	.6
6	3	1.0
10	1	.3
12	<u>2</u>	<u>.6</u>
Subtotal	311	100.0
No Response	<u>12</u>	
Total	<u>323</u>	

WHEN MORE THAN ONE CASE, RECORD ONLY MOST RECENT

51. What type of problem was the most recent problem? (Check one)

			<u>PERCENT RESPONDING</u>
1-	<u>47</u>	Housing	14.6
2-	<u>48</u>	Consumer problem	15.0
3-	<u>85</u>	Family or domestic affairs	26.5
4-	<u>51</u>	Administrative/Government benefits (welfare, food stamps, etc.)	15.9
5-	<u>31</u>	Employment and discrimination	9.7
6-	<u>59</u>	Other (Please specify) _____	<u>18.4</u>
	<u>321</u>	Subtotal	100.0
	<u>2</u>	No Response	
	<u>323</u>	Total	

52. Who from your household was involved? (Check those which apply)

			<u>As a Percent of 323</u>
1-	<u>273</u>	Self	84.5
2-	<u>77</u>	Spouse	23.8
3-	<u>37</u>	Child	11.5
4-	<u>19</u>	Other relative (Please specify) _____	5.9
5-	<u>16</u>	Non relative (Please specify) _____	5.0

53. Please explain the case:

APPENDIX III

APPENDIX III

54. What was the outcome of the case? (interpret answer and check one)

		<u>PERCENT RESPONDING</u>
1- <u>164</u>	Still going on - unresolved	50.9
2- <u>55</u>	Household member's objective substantially obtained	17.1
3- <u>15</u>	Household member's objective somewhat obtained	4.7
4- <u>65</u>	Household member's objective not obtained	20.2
5- <u>23</u>	Other (Please specify) _____	<u>7.1</u>
<u>322</u>	Subtotal	100.0
<u>1</u>	No Response	
<u>323</u>	Total	

55. Did you or anyone in your household have legal help with this case? (Check one)

		<u>PERCENT RESPONDING</u>
1- <u>117</u>	Yes	36.3
2- <u>205</u>	No (GC TO Q 58)	<u>63.7</u>
<u>322</u>	Subtotal	100.0
<u>1</u>	No Response	
<u>323</u>	Total	

56. What type of lawyer was used? (Check one)

		<u>PERCENT RESPONDING</u>
1- <u>52</u>	Private	44.4
2- <u>44</u>	Legal aid	37.6
3- <u>7</u>	Neighborhood legal services	6.0
4- _____	Law school clinic - provide list to select from (Which one? _____)	
5- <u>1</u>	Public interest (Check one)	.9
51- <u>1</u>	ACLU	
52- _____	NAACP	
53- _____	Urban League	
54- _____	Other (Please specify) _____	
6- <u>13</u>	Other (Please specify) _____	<u>11.1</u>
<u>117</u>	Total	100.0

57. How was this lawyer found? (Check one box per item)

Did you:	1-Yes	2-No	Subtotal	No Response	Total
(1) See lawyer before	16	93	109	8	117
(2) Know lawyer personally	18	91	109	8	117
(3) Get lawyer's name from a friend	39	72	111	6	117
(4) Find lawyer in phone book	5	101	106	11	117
(5) Get lawyer's name from welfare, food stamp, etc. agency	13	93	106	11	117
(6) See advertising about lawyer or legal service	6	100	106	11	117
(7) Other (Please specify) _____	34	55	89	28	117

(GO TO Q 60)

THOSE WHO FOUND A LAWYER

<u>Code</u>	<u>Yes Response</u>	<u>as</u>	<u>A Percent of 117</u>
1	16		13.7
2	18		15.4
3	39		33.3
4	5		4.3
5	13		11.1
6	6		5.1
7	34		29.1

58. Why wasn't a lawyer used? (Check one box per item)

Did you:	1-Yes	2-No	Subtotal	No Response	Total
(1) Feel you could handle the problem yourself	44	145	189	16	205
(2) Think it would be too expensive	112	79	191	14	205
(3) Go to a lawyer who then didn't take your case	10	176	186	19	205
(4) Not know how to get a lawyer	22	164	186	19	205
(5) Feel that lawyers could not be trusted	8	178	186	19	205
(6) Find you didn't have transportation to get a lawyer	9	177	186	19	205
(7) Have other kinds of assistance	2	183	185	20	205
(8) Other (Please specify) _____	66	99	165	40	205

Those Answering		as	A Percent of 205
Code	<u>Yes</u>		
1	44		21.5
2	112		54.6
3	10		4.9
4	22		10.7
5	8		3.9
6	9		4.4
7	2		1.0
8	66		32.2

59. Looking back, do you think it would have been better to consult with a lawyer? (Check all that apply)

			<u>PERCENT RESPONDING</u>
1-	<u>43</u>	No	22.1
2-	<u>152</u>	Yes	77.9
21-	<u>97</u>	Probably could have had a better chance	
22-	<u>79</u>	Could have used some advice	
23-	<u>1</u>	Got misled by others	
24-	<u>29</u>	Did not know procedures	
25-	<u>11</u>	Other (Please specify) _____	
<u>195</u> Subtotal			<u>100.0</u>
	<u>10</u>	No Response	
	<u>205</u>	Total	

Now I'm going to read you some situations that people are sometimes faced with. Could you tell me if you, or any member of your family, have been faced with a similar situation within the last 2 years.

(Interviewer: As you are reading the various situations it is possible the respondent will remember a dispute that occurred where a lawyer's help was sought. Place a star next to the appropriate question and return to it after you have completed this section.)

VI CONSUMER PROBLEMS

60. Have you or anyone in your household owed money to anyone which you could not pay? (Check one)

		PERCENT RESPONDING
1- <u>430</u>	Yes	34.2
2- <u>829</u>	No (GO TO Q 64)	65.8
<u>1259</u>	Subtotal	100.0
<u>1</u>	No Response	
<u>1260</u>	Total	

61. What happened as a result of your owing this money? (Check one)

Did someone:	1-Yes	2-No	Subtotal	No Response	Total
(1) Call your employer demanding you pay	33	311	344	8	430
(2) Threaten to bring you to court	193	188	381	49	430
(3) Threaten to take away some of your property	59	288	347	83	430
(4) Take away your property	18	321	339	91	430
(5) Other Please specify) _____	166	152	318	112	430

Code	These Answering as Yes	A Percent of 430
1	33	7.7
2	193	44.9
3	59	13.7
4	18	4.2
5	166	38.6

62. How did you go about trying to solve the problem? (Check those which apply)

		As a Percent of 430
1- <u>348</u>	Tried to work it out with the party concerned by myself	80.9
2- <u>13</u>	Talked to friends	3.0
3- <u>15</u>	Talked to a lawyer	3.5
4- <u>1</u>	Talked to a clergyperson	.2
5- <u> </u>	Talked to a politician	
6- <u>17</u>	Talked to a government official (e.g. housing, health, etc.)	4.0
7- <u>14</u>	Went to court	3.3
8- <u>48</u>	Other (Please specify) _____	11.2
9- <u>39</u>	Didn't do anything	
	Why? _____	9.1
<u>8</u>	No Response	

63. What was the outcome? (Check those which apply)

1- <u>6</u>	It was a mistake - I owed nothing	1.4
2- <u>91</u>	Paid the money	21.2
3- <u>10</u>	Returned property/merchandise	2.3
4- <u>72</u>	Worked out a partial settlement	16.7
5- <u>130</u>	Still being discussed/negotiated	30.2
6- <u>107</u>	Not being pressured currently	24.9
7- <u>98</u>	Other (Please specify) _____	22.8
<u>11</u>	No Response	

APPENDIX III

APPENDIX III

64. Did you or anyone in your household ever pay for repairs (e.g. car, appliance, furniture) that you felt were not done right? (Check one)

		<u>PERCENT RESPONDING</u>
1- <u>207</u>	Yes	
	Describe: _____	16.5
2- <u>1051</u>	No (GO TO Q 67)	<u>83.5</u>
<u>1258</u>	Subtotal	100.0
<u>2</u>	No Response	
<u>1260</u>	Total	

65. How did you go about trying to solve the problem? (Check those which apply)

		<u>As a Percent of 207</u>
1- <u>149</u>	Tried to work it out with the party concerned by myself	72.0
2- <u>3</u>	Talked to friends	1.4
3- <u>6</u>	Talked to a lawyer	2.9
4- _____	Talked to a clergyperson	
5- _____	Talked to a politician	
6- <u>2</u>	Talked to a government official (e.g. housing, health, etc.)	1.0
7- <u>1</u>	Went to court	.5
8- <u>19</u>	Other (Please specify) _____	9.2
9- <u>46</u>	Didn't do anything	
	Why? _____	22.2
<u>1</u>	No Response	

66. What was the outcome? (Check those which apply)

1- <u>50</u>	Repairs were redone	24.1
2- <u>9</u>	All money was returned	4.3
3- <u>6</u>	Some money was returned	2.9
4- <u>30</u>	Complained and am waiting	14.5
5- <u>12</u>	Is being discussed/negotiated	5.8
6- <u>31</u>	Have not complained	15.0
7- <u>16</u>	Repairperson says it is my fault	7.7
8- <u>33</u>	Other (Please specify) _____	40.1
<u>5</u>	No Response	

VII WAGES

67. Have you ever had a serious problem collecting wages owed? (Check one)

		<u>PERCENT RESPONDING</u>
1-	<u>80</u> Yes Describe _____	6.4
2-	<u>1177</u> No (GO TO Q 70)	<u>93.6</u>
	<u>1257</u> Subtotal	<u>100.0</u>
	<u>3</u> No Response	
	<u>1260</u> Total	

68. How did you go about trying to solve the problem? (Check those which apply)

		<u>As a Percent of 80</u>
1-	<u>54</u> Tried to work it out with the party concerned by myself	67.5
2-	<u>4</u> Talked to friends	5.0
3-	<u>4</u> Talked to a lawyer	5.0
4-	<u> </u> Talked to a clergy person	
5-	<u> </u> Talked to a politician	
6-	<u>12</u> Talked to a government official (e.g. housing, health, etc.)	15.0
7-	<u>2</u> Went to court	2.5
8-	<u>23</u> Other (Please specify) _____ _____	28.7
9-	<u>7</u> Didn't do anything Why? _____ _____	8.7
	<u>2</u> No Response	

69. What was the outcome? (Check those which apply)

1-	<u>33</u> Collected entire amount owed	41.3
2-	<u>7</u> Collected part of the amount owed	8.7
3-	<u>7</u> Complained and am waiting	8.7
4-	<u>8</u> Is being discussed/negotiated	10.0
5-	<u>2</u> Employer has moved	2.5
6-	<u>25</u> Other (Please specify) _____ _____	32.5
	<u>3</u> No Response	

VIII DOMESTIC AFFAIRS

70. Have you ever been separated from a spouse? (Check one)

		<u>PERCENT RESPONDING</u>
1-	<u>401</u> Yes	31.9
2-	<u>857</u> No (GO TO Q 72)	<u>68.1</u>
	<u>1258</u> Subtotal	100.0
	<u>2</u> No Response	
	<u>1260</u> Total	

71. How was this accomplished? (Check those which apply)

		<u>As a Percent of 401</u>
1-	<u>225</u> Worked it out with spouse alone	56.1
2-	<u>6</u> Worked it out with spouse and friends	1.5
3-	<u>107</u> Consulted a lawyer	26.7
4-	<u>1</u> Consulted a clergyperson	.2
5-	<u>72</u> Went to court	18.0
6-	<u>42</u> Had a written, signed agreement	10.5
7-	<u>55</u> Other (Please specify) _____	13.7
	<u>15</u> No Response	

72. Have you requested separate child support from an ex-spouse? (Check one)

		<u>PERCENT RESPONDING</u>
1-	<u>160</u> Yes	12.8
2-	<u>1093</u> No (GO TO Q 75)	<u>87.2</u>
	<u>1253</u> Subtotal	100.0
	<u>7</u> No Response	
	<u>1260</u> Total	

73. How did you go about trying to solve the problem? (Check those which apply)

		<u>As a Percent of 160</u>
1- <u>61</u>	Tried to work it out with ex-spouse	38.1
2- <u>2</u>	Tried to work it out with ex-spouse and friends	1.2
3- <u>39</u>	Talked to a lawyer	24.4
4- <u> </u>	Talked to a clergyperson	
5- <u>73</u>	Went to court	45.6
6- <u>31</u>	Other (Please specify) <u> </u>	19.4
<u>3</u>	No Response	

74. What was the outcome? (Check those which apply)

1- <u>45</u>	Received what I requested	28.1
2- <u>5</u>	Received more than I requested	3.1
3- <u>51</u>	Received less than I requested	31.9
4- <u>18</u>	Still being discussed/negotiated	11.2
5- <u>28</u>	Can't contact ex-spouse	17.5
6- <u>23</u>	Other (Please specify) <u> </u>	14.4
<u>6</u>	No Response	

75. Have you been threatened with non-support?
(Check one)

		<u>PERCENT RESPONDING</u>
1- <u>22</u>	Yes	1.8
	Describe: <u> </u>	
2- <u>1229</u>	No (GO TO Q 78)	<u>98.2</u>
<u>1251</u>	Subtotal	100.0
<u>9</u>	No Response	
<u>1260</u>	Total	

76. How did you go about trying to solve the problem? (Check those which apply)

		<u>As a Percent of 22</u>
1- <u>13</u>	Tried to work it out with ex-spouse	59.1
2- <u> </u>	Tried to work it out with ex-spouse and friends	
3- <u>5</u>	Talked to a lawyer	22.7
4- <u> </u>	Talked to a clergyperson	
5- <u>5</u>	Went to court	22.7
6- <u>5</u>	Other (Please specify) <u> </u>	22.7
7- <u>3</u>	Didn't do anything Why? <u> </u>	13.6
<u>Varied</u> No Response		

77. What was the outcome? (Check those which apply)

1- <u>7</u>	Support not changed	31.8
2- <u> </u>	Support increased	
3- <u>2</u>	Support lessened	9.1
4- <u>4</u>	Still being discussed/negotiated	18.2
5- <u>1</u>	Can't contact ex-spouse	4.5
6- <u>9</u>	Other (Please specify) <u> </u>	40.9
<u>1</u>	No Response	

IX HOUSING

78. Have you ever received notice to move? (Check one)

		<u>PERCENT RESPONDING</u>
1- <u>154</u>	Yes Describe: _____	12.2
2- <u>1104</u>	No (GO TO Q 81)	<u>87.8</u>
<u>1258</u>	Subtotal	100.0
<u>2</u>	No Response	
<u>1260</u>	Total	

79. How did you go about trying to solve the problem? (Check those which apply)

		<u>As a Percent of 154</u>
1- <u>91</u>	Tried to work it out with the party concerned by myself	59.1
2- <u>9</u>	Talked to friends	5.8
3- <u>15</u>	Talked to a lawyer	9.7
4- <u>2</u>	Talked to a clergyperson	1.3
5- _____	Talked to a politician	
6- <u>7</u>	Talked to a government official (e.g. housing, health, etc)	4.5
7- <u>2</u>	Went to court	1.3
8- <u>21</u>	Other (Please specify) _____	13.6
9- <u>39</u>	Didn't do anything Why? _____	25.3
<u>Varied</u> No Response		

80. What was the outcome? (Check those which apply)

1- <u>105</u>	I had to move	68.2
2- <u>32</u>	I did not have to move	20.8
3- <u>13</u>	Still being discussed/negotiated	8.4
4- <u>9</u>	Other (Please specify) _____	5.8
<u>1</u>	No Response	

Have you ever had a problem getting back a security deposit? (Check one)

		<u>PERCENT RESPONDING</u>
1- <u>106</u>	Yes Describe: _____	8.9
2- <u>1091</u>	No (GO TO Q 84)	<u>91.1</u>
<u>1197</u>	Subtotal	100.0
<u>63</u>	No Response	
<u>1260</u>	Total	

82. How did you go about trying to solve the problem? (Check those which apply)

		<u>As a Percent of 106</u>
1- <u>71</u>	Tried to work it out with the party concerned by myself	67.0
2- <u>6</u>	Talked to friends	5.7
3- <u>4</u>	Talked to a lawyer	3.8
4- _____	Talked to a clergyperson	
5- _____	Talked to a politician	
6- <u>1</u>	Talked to a government official (e.g. housing, health, etc.)	.9
7- <u>5</u>	Went to court	4.7
8- <u>9</u>	Other (Please specify) _____	8.5
9- <u>30</u>	Didn't do anything Why? _____	28.3
<u>Varied</u>	No Response	

83. What was the outcome? (Check those which apply)

1- <u>79</u>	Lost the deposit	74.5
2- <u>17</u>	Got back part of deposit	16.0
3- <u>7</u>	Got back entire deposit	6.6
4- <u>2</u>	Still being discussed/negotiated	1.9
5- <u>5</u>	Other (Please specify) _____	4.7
<u>Varied</u>	No Response	

84. Have you had any of the following problems for a long period of time? (Check one box for each item)

	1-Yes	2-No	Subtotal	No Response	Total
(1) Broken locks	57	1082	1139	121	1260
(2) Broken doors/windows	133	1006	1139	121	1260
(3) Leaky roof	130	1009	1139	121	1260
(4) Rats	111	1025	1136	124	1260
(5) Rodents/roaches	288	855	1143	117	1260
(6) Not enough heat	94	1049	1143	117	1260
(7) Not enough hot water	90	1049	1139	121	1260
(8) Unclean building	61	1075	1136	124	1260

Code	Those Answering		A Percent of 1260
	Yes	as	
1	57		4.5
2	133		10.6
3	130		10.3
4	111		8.8
5	288		22.9
6	94		7.5
7	90		7.1
8	61		4.8

IF MORE THAN ONE, SELECT THE MOST RECENT PROBLEM AND DESCRIBE:

NUMBER _____

IF NONE, GO TO Q 87

<u>Problem Code (per Q. 84)</u>	<u>Most Recent Problem Selected</u>	<u>as</u>	<u>A Percent of 1260</u>
1	21		1.7
2	55		4.4
3	64		5.1
4	48		3.8
5	166		13.2
6	49		3.9
7	27		2.1
8	<u>14</u>		<u>1.1</u>
Subtotal	444		35.2
None	<u>816</u>		<u>64.8</u>
Total	<u>1260</u>		<u>100.0</u>

85. How did you go about trying to solve the problem? (Check those which apply)

			<u>As a Percent of 444</u>
1-	<u>325</u>	Tried to work it out with the party concerned by myself	73.2
2-	<u>31</u>	Talked to friends	7.0
3-	<u>6</u>	Talked to a lawyer	1.4
4-	<u> </u>	Talked to a clergyperson	
5-	<u> </u>	Talked to a politician	
6-	<u>37</u>	Talked to a government official (e.g. housing, health, etc.)	8.3
7-	<u> </u>	Went to court	
8-	<u>50</u>	Other (Please specify) <u> </u>	11.3
9-	<u>60</u>	Didn't do anything Why? <u> </u>	13.5
	<u>2</u>	No Response	

86. What was the outcome? (Check those which apply)

1-	<u>122</u>	Made the repair or correction myself	27.5
2-	<u>89</u>	Landlord made repair or correction	20.0
3-	<u>45</u>	Moved to another location	10.1
4-	<u>97</u>	Still being discussed/negotiated	21.8
5-	<u> </u>	Other (Please specify) <u> </u>	
	<u>114</u>	No Response	

87. Has your landlord tried to raise the rent or evict you? (Check one)

		<u>PERCENT RESPONDING</u>
1- <u>167</u>	Yes Describe: _____	14.0
2- <u>1028</u>	No (GO TO Q 90)	<u>86.0</u>
<u>1195</u>	Subtotal	100.0
<u>65</u>	No Response	
<u>1260</u>	Total	

88. How did you go about trying to solve the problem? (Check those which apply)

		<u>As a Percent of 167</u>
1- <u>9</u>	Tried to work it out with the party concerned	47.3
2- <u>7</u>	Talked to friends	4.2
3- <u>3</u>	Talked to a lawyer	1.8
4- _____	Talked to a clergyperson	
5- _____	Talked to a politician	
6- <u>17</u>	Talked to a government official (e.g. housing, health, etc.)	10.2
7- _____	Went to court	
8- <u>8</u>	Other (Please specify) _____	4.8
9- <u>70</u>	Didn't do anything Why? _____	41.9
<u>3</u>	No Response	

89. What was the outcome? (Check those which apply)

1- <u>105</u>	I was evicted/rent was raised	62.9
2- <u>11</u>	I was not evicted/rent was not raised	6.6
3- <u>6</u>	Still being discussed/negotiated	3.6
4- <u>47</u>	Other (Please specify) _____	28.1
<u>5</u>	No Response	

90. Have you ever withheld your rent or applied rent to repairs? (Check one)

		<u>PERCENT RESPONDING</u>
1- <u>76</u>	Yes Describe: _____	6.4
2- <u>1108</u>	No (GO TO Q 93)	<u>93.6</u>
<u>1184</u>	Subtotal	100.0
<u>76</u>	No Response	
<u>1260</u>	Total	

91. How did you go about trying to solve the problem? (Check those which apply)

		<u>As a Percent of 76</u>
1- <u>60</u>	Withheld rent on my own	78.9
2- <u>3</u>	Withheld rent along with others	3.9
3- <u>5</u>	Talked to a lawyer	6.6
4- _____	Talked to a clergyperson	
5- _____	Talked to a politician	
6- <u>1</u>	Talked to a government official (e.g. housing, health, etc.)	1.3
7- <u>1</u>	Went to court	1.3
8- <u>12</u>	Other (Please specify) _____	15.8
<u>7</u>	No Response	

92. What was the outcome? (Check those which apply)

1- <u>35</u>	Repairs were made	46.1
2- <u>13</u>	Rent was reduced	17.1
3- <u>3</u>	Still being discussed/negotiated	3.9
4- <u>11</u>	Nothing	14.5
5- <u>21</u>	Other (Please specify) _____	27.6
<u>9</u>	No Response	

X JUVENILE

93. Do you have children between the ages of 5 and 22 living in the household

			<u>PERCENT RESPONDING</u>
1-	<u>534</u>	Yes (CONTINUE)	42.5
2-	<u>723</u>	No (GO TO Q 97)	<u>57.5</u>
	<u>1257</u>	Subtotal	100.0
	<u>3</u>	No Response	
	<u>1260</u>	Total	

94. Have any of the children been: (Check one box per item)

	1-Yes	2-No	Subtotal	No Response	Total
(1) Suspended from school	54	467	521	13	534
(2) Threatened/attacked physically	61	458	519	15	534
(3) Refused admission to public school	5	513	518	16	534
(4) Threatened by a truant officer with a court complaint	7	509	516	18	534
(5) Arrested	30	489	519	15	534
(6) Sick from lead poisoning	1	516	517	17	534

<u>Code</u>	Those Answering		A Percent of 534
	Yes	as	
1	54		10.1
2	61		11.4
3	5		.9
4	7		1.3
5	30		5.6
6	1		.2

IF MORE THAN ONE, SELECT THE MOST SERIOUS PROBLEM AND DESCRIBE.

NUMBER _____

IF NONE, GO TO Q 97

<u>Problem Code (per Q. 94)</u>	<u>Most Recent Problem Selected</u>	<u>as</u>	<u>A Percent of 534</u>
1	39		7.3
2	49		9.2
3	3		.6
4	3		.6
5	23		4.3
6	<u>1</u>		<u>.2</u>
Subtotal	118		22.1
None	<u>416</u>		<u>77.9</u>
Total	<u>534</u>		<u>100.0</u>

95. How did you go about trying to solve the problem? (Check those which apply)

		<u>As a Percent of 118</u>
1- <u>54</u>	Tried to work it out with the party concerned by myself	45.8
2- <u>4</u>	Talked to friends	3.4
3- <u>3</u>	Talked to a lawyer	2.5
4- <u> </u>	Talked to a clergyperson	
5- <u> </u>	Talked to a politician	
6- <u>15</u>	Talked to a government official (e.g. housing, health, etc.)	12.7
7- <u>15</u>	Went to court	12.7
8- <u>36</u>	Other (Please specify) <u> </u>	30.5
9- <u>10</u>	Didn't do anything	
	Why? <u> </u>	8.5
<u>Varied</u>	No response	

96. What was the outcome? (Please specify)

<u>Outcome</u>	<u>Problems</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Resolved	98	83.1
Unresolved	14	11.9
Pending	<u>6</u>	<u>5.1</u>
Total	<u>118</u>	<u>100.0</u>

XI WORK INJURY

97. Have you been injured at work? (Check one)

PERCENT RESPONDING

1- <u>149</u>	Yes	
	Describe: _____	11.9
2- <u>1107</u>	No (GO TO Q 101)	<u>88.1</u>
<u>1256</u>	Subtotal	100.0
<u>4</u>	No Response	
<u>1260</u>	Total	

98. What problem(s) resulted from this?

As a Percent of 149

1- <u>28</u>	No compensation for physical disability	18.8
2- <u>43</u>	Loss of job	28.9
3- <u>22</u>	Unpaid medical bills	14.8
4- <u>23</u>	Other _____	
	_____	15.4
5- <u>77</u>	No problems (GO TO Q 101)	51.7
<u>1</u>	No Response	

99. How did you go about trying to solve the problem? (Check those which apply)

		<u>As a Percent of 149</u>
1- <u>33</u>	Tried to work it out with the party concerned by myself	22.1
2- <u>4</u>	Talked to friends	2.7
3- <u>19</u>	Talked to a lawyer	12.8
4- <u> </u>	Talked to a clergyperson	
5- <u> </u>	Talked to a politician	
6- <u>7</u>	Talked to a government official (e.g. housing, health, etc.)	4.7
7- <u>3</u>	Went to court	2.0
8- <u>15</u>	Other (Please specify) _____	10.1
9- <u>16</u>	Didn't do anything	
	Why? _____	10.7
<u>1</u>	No Response	

100. What was the outcome? (Please specify)

<u>Outcome</u>	<u>Problems</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Resolved	42	28.2
Unresolved	13	8.7
Pending	<u>12</u>	<u>8.1</u>
Subtotal	67	45.0
No Response	<u>82</u>	<u>55.0</u>
Total	<u>149</u>	<u>100.0</u>

XI ADMINISTRATIVE

101. Have you or anyone in your household had a problem with the following
(Check one box per item)

	1-Yes	2-No	Subtotal	No Response	Total
(1) AFDC - Aid to Families with Dependent Children	54	1164	1213	42	1260
(2) GR - General Relief	35	1184	1219	41	1260
(3) OAA - (Older American's Act - various aging programs)	1	1217	1218	42	1260
(4) SSI - (Supplemental Security Income - Social Security)	55	1165	1220	40	1260
(5) Aid to Disabled	10	1209	1219	41	1260
(6) Aid to Blind	1	1217	1218	42	1260
(7) Medicaid/Medicare	30	1189	1219	41	1260
(8) Social Security	56	1163	1219	41	1260
(9) Veteran's Disability or Pension	10	1209	1219	41	1260
(10) Unemployment Benefits	50	1169	1219	41	1260
(11) Food Stamps	61	1159	1220	40	1260
(12) Workmen's Compensation	22	1196	1213	42	1260

Those Answering		as	A Percent of 1260
Code	Yes		
1	54		4.3
2	35		2.8
3	1		.1
4	55		4.4
5	10		.3
6	1		.1
7	30		2.4
8	56		4.4
9	10		.8
10	50		4.0
11	61		4.8
12	22		1.7

APPENDIX III

APPENDIX III

IF MORE THAN ONE, SELECT THE MOST SERIOUS PROBLEM
AND DESCRIBE

NUMBER _____

IF NONE GO TO Q 104

<u>Problem Code (per Q. 101)</u>	<u>Most Serious Problem Selected</u>	as	<u>A Percent of 1260</u>
1	51		4.0
2	23		1.8
3	1		.1
4	41		3.3
5	7		.6
6	4		.3
7	17		1.3
8	41		3.3
9	8		.6
10	40		3.2
11	29		2.3
12	<u>12</u>		<u>1.0</u>
Subtotal	274		21.7
No Response	<u>986</u>		<u>78.3</u>
Total	<u>1260</u>		<u>100.0</u>

102. How did you go about trying to solve the problem? (Check those which apply)

		<u>As a Percent of 274</u>
1- <u>140</u>	Tried to work it out with the party concerned by myself	51.1
2- <u>17</u>	Talked to friends	6.2
3- <u>27</u>	Talked to a lawyer	9.9
4- <u>2</u>	Talked to a clergyperson	.7
5- <u>4</u>	Talked to a politician	1.5
6- <u>121</u>	Talked to a government official (e.g. housing, health, etc.)	44.2
7- <u>6</u>	Went to court	2.2
8- <u>36</u>	Other (Please specify) _____	13.1
9- <u>34</u>	Didn't do anything	
	Why? _____	12.4
<u>Varied</u>	No Response	

103. What was the outcome? (Please specify)

<u>Outcome</u>	<u>Problems</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Resolved	119	43.4
Unresolved	64	23.4
Pending	<u>85</u>	<u>31.0</u>
Subtotal	268	97.8
No Response	<u>6</u>	<u>2.2</u>
Total	<u>274</u>	<u>100.0</u>

104. Are you or anyone in your household receiving or have you received AFDC benefits? (Check one)

PERCENT RESPONDING

1- <u>346</u>	Yes	27.6
2- <u>907</u>	No (GO TO Q 108)	<u>72.4</u>
<u>1253</u>	Subtotal	100.0
<u>7</u>	No Response	
<u>1260</u>	Total	

105. Have you had any of the following problems while receiving AFDC? (Check one box per item)

	1-Yes	2-No	Subtotal	No Response	Total
(1) Been behind in rent for more than 2 months	37	300	337	9	346
(2) Been behind in utility bills for over 2 months	45	291	336	10	346
(3) Had an appliance stop working	52	282	334	12	346
(4) Needed a special diet	47	285	332	14	346
(5) Needed moving expenses	28	297	325	21	346
(6) Had a fire that damaged your goods or property	14	316	330	16	346
(7) Had goods or property stolen/vandalized	46	285	331	15	346

Those Answering		as	A Percent of 346
Code	Yes		
1	37		10.7
2	45		13.0
3	52		15.0
4	47		13.6
5	28		8.1
6	14		4.0
7	46		13.3

IF MORE THAN ONE, SELECT THE MOST SERIOUS PROBLEM AND DESCRIBE.

NUMBER _____

IF NONE, GO TO Q 108

<u>Problem Code (per Q. 105)</u>	<u>Most Serious Problem Selected</u>	<u>as</u>	<u>A Percent of 346</u>
1	22		6.4
2	26		7.5
3	19		5.5
4	24		6.9
5	9		2.6
6	11		3.2
7	29		8.4
Subtotal	140		40.5
No Response	206		59.5
Total	<u>346</u>		<u>100.0</u>

106. How did you go about trying to solve the problem? (Check those which apply)

		<u>As a Percent of 140</u>
1- <u>53</u>	Tried to work it out with the party concerned by myself	37.9
2- <u>10</u>	Talked to friends	7.1
3- <u>2</u>	Talked to a lawyer	1.4
4- <u> </u>	Talked to a clergyperson	
5- <u> </u>	Talked to a politician	
6- <u>26</u>	Talked to a government official (e.g. housing, health, etc.)	18.6
7- <u> </u>	Went to court	
8- <u>45</u>	Other (Please specify) <u> </u>	32.1
9- <u>29</u>	Didn't do anything	
	Why? <u> </u>	20.7
<u>Varied</u> No Response		

107. What was the outcome? (Please specify)

<u>Outcome</u>	<u>Problems</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Resolved	99	70.7
Unresolved	27	19.3
Pending	<u>13</u>	<u>9.3</u>
Subtotal	139	99.3
No Response	<u>1</u>	<u>.7</u>
Total	<u>140</u>	<u>100.0</u>

108. Have you or anyone in your household had a problem with the following?
(Check one box per item)

	1-Yes	2-No	Subtotal	No Response	Total
(1) Registry of Motor Vehicles	9	327	336	10	346
(2) Immigration	4	332	336	10	346
(3) Internal Revenue Service	3	333	336	10	346
(4) Registering to vote	2	334	336	10	346

Those Answering

Code	Yes	as	A Percent of 346
1	9		2.6
2	4		1.2
3	3		.9
4	2		.6

IF MORE THAN ONE, SELECT THE MOST RECENT PROBLEM AND DESCRIBE.
NUMBER _____

Problem Code (per Q. 108)	Most Recent Problem Selected	as	A Percent of 346
1	6		1.7
2	3		.9
3	3		.9
4	1		.3
Subtotal	13		3.8
None	333		96.2
Total	346		100.0

109. How did you go about trying to solve the problem? (Check those which apply)

		<u>As a Percent of 13</u>
1- <u>7</u>	Tried to work it out with the party concerned by myself	53.8
2- <u> </u>	Talked to friends	
3- <u>2</u>	Talked to a lawyer	15.4
4- <u> </u>	Talked to a clergyperson	
5- <u> </u>	Talked to a politician	
6- <u>5</u>	Talked to a government official (e.g. housing, health, etc.)	38.5
7- <u> </u>	Went to court	
8- <u>2</u>	Other (Please specify) <u> </u>	15.4
9- <u>2</u>	Didn't do anything	
	Why? <u> </u>	15.4
<u>1</u>	No Response	

110. What was the outcome? (Please specify)

<u>Outcome</u>	<u>Problems</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Resolved	8	61.5
Unresolved	2	15.4
Pending	<u>?</u>	<u>23.1</u>
Total	<u>13</u>	<u>100.0</u>

111. Do you know of any free legal services offered in your neighborhood or in _____? (Check one)

(City/County)

		PERCENT RESPONDING
1- <u>515</u>	Yes	41.5 ^{2/}
2- <u>727</u>	No (GO TO Q 117)	58.5
<u>1242</u>	Subtotal	100.0
<u>18</u>	No Response	
<u>1260</u>	Total	

112. What is the name and location of this service?

As a Percent of 515

Information Provided: 429

83.3

113. How did you find out about this legal service? (Check those which apply)

As a Percent of 515

1- <u>232</u>	Friends	45.0
2- <u>115</u>	Welfare/Community Service	22.3
3- <u>4</u>	Lawyer	.8
4- <u>1</u>	Clergy	.2
5- _____	Politician	
6- <u>19</u>	T.V./Radio	3.7
7- <u>22</u>	Newspaper	4.3
8- <u>6</u>	Flyer/Bulletin board etc.	1.2
9- <u>121</u>	Other (Please specify) _____	23.5

114. Do you understand what type of services are offered? (Check one)

		<u>As a Percent of 515</u>
1- <u>233</u>	Yes	45.2
11- <u>148</u>	Civil Legal	28.7
12- <u>3</u>	Criminal	.6
13- <u>24</u>	Other description (Please specify) _____	4.7
<u>58</u>	No Description	11.3
2- <u>224</u>	No	<u>43.5</u>
<u>457</u>	Subtotal	88.7
<u>58</u>	No Response	<u>11.3</u>
<u>515</u>	Total	<u>100.0</u>

115. Have you made use of free legal services? (Check one)

		<u>As a Percent of 515</u>
1- <u>207</u>	Yes Approx. number of times <u>AS BELOW</u>	40.2
2- <u>255</u>	No (GO TO Q 117)	<u>49.5</u>
<u>462</u>	Subtotal	89.7
<u>53</u>	No Response	<u>10.3</u>
<u>515</u>	Total	<u>100.0</u>

Indicated Number of Times Free Legal Services Were Used	Responses	As a Percent of 207
1	120	58.0
2	22	10.6
3	11	5.3
4	1	.5
5	2	1.0
10	<u>1</u>	<u>.5</u>
Subtotal	157	75.8
No Response	<u>50</u>	<u>24.2</u>
Total	<u>207</u>	<u>100.0</u>

116. How useful were the services?

1- <u>36</u>	Of little or no use	17.4
2- <u>30</u>	Somewhat useful	14.5
3- <u>27</u>	Moderately useful	13.0
4- <u>32</u>	Substantially useful	15.5
5- <u>73</u>	Very useful	<u>37.7</u>
<u>203</u>	Subtotal	98.1
<u>4</u>	No Response	<u>1.9</u>
<u>207</u>	Total	<u>100.0</u>

117. Would you use a legal services office if there were one in your neighborhood?
(Check one)

		PERCENT RESPONDING
1- <u>1175</u>	Yes	94.5
2- <u>69</u>	No	<u>5.5</u>
	Why not? _____	
<u>1244</u>	Subtotal	100.0
<u>16</u>	No Response	
<u>1260</u>	Total	

1/Percents may not add to total due to rounding.

2/Percentages ranged from 4.5% to 74.0% among states and communities where interviews were conducted.

**LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION**

733 Fifteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D. C. 20005 (202) 376-5100

Thomas Ehrlich

President

F. Clinton Bamberger, Jr.

Executive Vice-President

September 11, 1978

Mr. Gregory J. Ahart
 Director
 Human Resources Division
 United States General Accounting Office
 1200 Nineteenth Street, N.W.
 Washington, D.C. 20548

Dear Mr. Ahart:

We welcome the opportunity to comment on the draft report prepared by your staff, entitled "Free Legal Services for the Poor - Delivery Can Be Improved Through Increased Coordination, Community Legal Education, and Outreach." The report addresses issues of primary concern to the Legal Services Corporation, and its findings and recommendations will aid us in our continuing efforts to improve the delivery of effective and efficient civil legal services to the poor.

You will recall that the Legal Services Corporation provided substantial support and assistance to the GAO effort to collect information on the resources available nationally for the provision of free civil legal assistance to the poor. It was our hope that your survey of the various types of legal services providers, both Corporation and non-Corporation sponsored, and potential clients, conducted in early 1977, would supply the Corporation and local grantees with valuable information for our efforts to deliver quality legal services to the poor. We are grateful that your survey results are finally available and provide a significant contribution to knowledge about legal assistance for low income persons.

Unfortunately, however, we must express some disappointment with the utility of the data displayed in the draft report. The report, for example, provides little information about the non-Corporation legal services providers surveyed. No description or analysis is offered regarding the types of non-Corporation organizations that provide legal services to the poor, or about the structural and operational differences among them. It would have been extremely useful, to cite one instance, to have some indication of the types of non-LSC programs that were most successful in securing financial support and assistance from the private bar.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS Roger C. Gilmont, Chairman, Ithaca, New York

J. Melville Broughton, Jr.
 Raleigh, North Carolina
 Hillary Rodham
 Little Rock, Arkansas

Steven I. Engelberg
 Washington, D.C.
 Glee S. Smith, Jr.
 Topeka, Kansas

Cecilia D. Esquer
 Phoenix, Arizona
 Glenn C. Stophel
 Chattanooga, Tennessee

Robert J. Kutak
 Omaha, Nebraska
 Richard Trudell
 Oakland, California

Revis O. Orligue, Jr.
 New Orleans, Louisiana
 Josephine Worthy
 Holyoke, Massachusetts

**LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION**

Mr. Gregory J. Ahart

-2-

September 11, 1978

There are other problems with the survey instruments and data which limit the value of the information provided. Many of the survey questions are confusing and difficult to understand, making the reliability of the data somewhat questionable. Further, no indication is given about the statistical significance of the response to individual survey questions. Because of the high grantee response rate, valuable information is lost by not indicating which responses have statistical significance. In addition, much of the data is, by now, unfortunately, out of date. As you know, the Corporation and local grantees have undertaken significant new and expanded activities since 1977, making obsolete much of the information reported at that time.

Despite the problems with the survey data, the Legal Services Corporation found the recommendations in the report to be extremely useful, and compatible with our efforts to implement necessary changes and improvements in the provision of legal services to the poor. The following are some specific comments on each chapter of the report that will, we hope, provide additional insight on these important areas of concern.

Chapter II

The recommendations in this chapter relate to the need for improved LSC coordination of federal and non-federal funding sources to ensure maximum utilization of all resources for the economical and efficient delivery of legal services.

We appreciate the effort involved in the identification and quantification of resources from non-LSC sources. The report does not make clear, however, several important points essential to a full understanding of the availability and utility of non-LSC funding sources. First, the non-LSC funding sources identified are, for the most part, general purpose funds, not specifically targeted for civil legal assistance to the poor. Title XX funds, for example, are provided to States to assist them in funding many different types of social services. CETA funds are designed to alleviate unemployment among the disadvantaged through training and job placement, and as a result CETA personnel may be placed in a legal services program as one of many sponsors in a community. Funds under Title III of the Older Americans Act are available for several purposes, including legal services for the elderly. They are not, however, targeted for the elderly poor and may not be subject to income limitations.

**LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION**

Mr. Gregory J. Ahart

-3-

September 11, 1978

A second and related point is that decisions concerning the particular use of most funds identified are made at the state and local level, and are obviously subject to change with varying amounts of notice. It has been the experience of many legal services programs utilizing these funds that they often do not provide a reliable basis to support on-going legal services in the community.

The Corporation, on the other hand, certainly recognizes the vital importance of non-Corporation funds for the provision of legal assistance to the poor. We appreciate your recommendation that greater efforts can be made to encourage and identify other resources devoted to this purpose, particularly increased efforts to involve bar associations and private attorneys in the delivery of free legal services to the poor.

Based on the report data, more than 25 percent of the low-income persons interviewed believed they faced a problem during the year that required a lawyer's assistance. That totals more than 7 million legal problems annually for those living at or below poverty levels. Last year, legal services workers were able to handle approximately 20 percent of these matters. Obviously the bar and private practitioners have an essential role and contribution to make in this area.

A great deal of my time and that of our Office of Public Affairs is devoted to encouraging bar associations and their members to become involved in legal services. Through active involvement and participation with the American Bar Association, its Standing Committee on Legal Aid and Indigent Defendants, and its Special Committee on the Delivery of Legal Services, the National Bar Association, the National Conference of Bar Presidents, and many other organizations, we are devoting significant efforts to enlist the support of bar associations throughout the country.

Chapter II also calls for increased coordination among LSC and non-LSC providers of legal services. We certainly agree with the importance of that coordination, and are continuing to seek improvements in our efforts and those of local grantees. Program coordination to maximize resources and avoid duplication of activities is mandated by Corporation regulation Section 1620.2, which requires all grantees to establish priorities for the allocation of resources that take into consideration "the availability of another source of free or low cost legal assistance in a particular category of cases or matters."

**LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION**

Mr. Gregory J. Ahart

-4-

September 11, 1978

Further, our regional offices, through regular monitoring and evaluation visits, review the efforts of grantees to coordinate their services with other providers in the communities, including law schools and clinics. Greater coordination among the various providers in the communities has been achieved during the last year, particularly as we have required increased communication and coordination with the local bar associations in expansion areas.

Chapter III

The recommendations of this chapter are consistent with Section 1007(a)(2)(C) of the Legal Services Corporation Act of 1974, which calls for grantees to adopt procedures for determining and implementing priorities for the provision of legal services. The questionnaire in the report and the conclusions reached, preceded the development of the Corporation's Case Service Reports and the continuing series of training workshops and seminars designed to enhance local program capability in priority-setting.

Local legal services programs regularly obtain various types of information on the recognized legal needs of their client communities. In addition, the Corporation's Case Service Reports will provide more uniform information that will be of assistance to programs in the priority setting process. Further, the requirement that clients be represented on the governing bodies of local programs, and participate in the priority-setting process, helps to ensure that program priorities reflect the legal needs of the community.

Formal surveys of the legal needs in a community are often extremely expensive and time-consuming, however, as indicated by several grantees that have experimented with surveys and formalized needs-assessment mechanisms. In recognition of scarce resources, it is, therefore, important to strike a balance between assessing the needs for legal services in a community for effective planning purposes and the direct delivery of these vital services.

**LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION**

Mr. Gregory J. Ahart

-5-

September 11, 1978

Chapter IV

The recommendations in this chapter are entirely consistent with on-going efforts by the Corporation to assist grantees and clients in the development and implementation of community education and outreach programs. Increasingly, grantees are recognizing the need for such programs, as well as preventive measures. Priority-setting sessions held by local programs usually rank community education as one of the top five priorities. Currently, there are more than 100 grantees with on-going community education efforts.

As the report notes, the Corporation conducted a national training session in June 1978 attended by 48 grantees. On-going efforts include updating our directory of existing community education efforts, on-going client training, particularly with emphasis on client board members, and the development of resources, including technical assistance, to meet the upsurge in interest in community education.

* * * * *

In sum, we are grateful for the report and the thoughtful manner in which it was prepared and its recommendations presented. We are working as rapidly as possible -- in light of limited resources -- to carry out those recommendations. Much of that work has been underway for some time, but we are agreed that even more efforts are needed in the future.

Cordially,

Thomas Ehrlich